THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

# QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XXIV.—JULY, 1899.—No. 95.

## POPE FORMOSUS AND REORDINATION.

THE student of Church history is often in despair of arriving at any definite conclusion in regard to matters which are vouched for as facts by some of the Church historians. To those who have spent some little time in reading the works or the criticisms of such writers as Labbe, Baronius, Natalis Alexander and Morinus, it is sufficient only to mention these names in order to recall the very opposite conclusion to which one is sometimes driven, the indecision of mind which seems to be the outcome of study a little more profound than usual, the fruitless efforts to put together a consistent account even of some of the more important episodes in the Church's history. If in this state of mind the student is willing to be sent to the original authorities from whom these writers have obtained their material, he may at first be tempted to think that now at last he will discover what are the facts, now he will be able to draw his own inferences. But he will probably find to his dismay that he is well-nigh incapable of following the train of thought of his author; the sense eludes his mental grasp; the conclusions of his premises are in many cases so obviously contradictory that he falls back upon any summary at hand, and is disposed to take as a sufficient guide what before seemed wholly inadequate. But throughout the course of his reading he has at least gained some good; he may remember what the original authorities do not say, or what they cannot consistently say. Indeed, this is a great good; for is it not a fact of almost daily occurrence in controversy that Fathers and Councils and

standard Catholic writers are quoted to confirm what they really contradict.

It is with the view of examining the evidence in the matter of Formosus that this sketch is written; it is to discover what is really told us about him in the Councils and the pages of those writers who were contemporary with him, or who were the earliest compilers of the history of his time. The subject is interesting, for it is closely allied with the teaching of the Church on the validity of ordinations; the manner of its treatment by various writers is also interesting on account of the opposite conclusions which have been drawn.

But it might seem unnecessary to discuss the question, since we can always appeal to the unerring guidance of the Church. Still, as has been done in so many other cases where the reasons for the Church's infallibility are either not understood or not accepted, so in this present case our plain course must be to test conclusions by the force of the evidence of history and language. Needless to say, the case of Pope Formosus, which has presented difficulties where no difficulty ought to arise, if only the true doctrine of infallibility were rightly understood, is one of many pressed into the service of controversy and supposed to disprove the Church's divine mission.

Briefly his career was as follows: He was Bishop of Porto; he was degraded in 876 by Pope John VIII.; he was absolved by Pope Marinus; he was later acclaimed Pope by the Roman people; after his death his body was dragged from the tomb, mutilated and thrown into the Tiber. His memory was, in turn, execrated and held in veneration. His decisions are said to have been reversed by Popes Stephen VI. and Sergius III., and by Councils under these Popes. Priests who were ordained by Formosus are said to have been reordained. On this story has been based a denial of infallibility, of purity of doctrine, of consistency in teaching, in short, of everything that makes the Church fit to direct the consciences of her subjects. We shall see if the conclusion is wholly justified by the premises, and if the premises themselves are true.

Now it has been stated by writers of every shade of belief that the Popes of the ninth and tenth centuries freely degraded and as freely reconsecrated—taking these terms as applying to validity and not to jurisdiction only—the nominees of their predecessors. Therefore, it is concluded, such Popes did not recognize the validity of those ordinations which they condemned; or, what is much worse, if they did consider such ordinations valid, then Popes and Councils have been guilty of grave error. Without com-

bating the distorted view of infallibility held by the Church's adversaries,—although an elementary knowledge of the Catholic doctrine should prevent a man from confounding infallibility with impeccability, the impossibility of erring under certain determined circumstances with the impossibility of sinning,—it will be sufficient for our present purpose to examine all the evidence we can get on the one question of Pope Formosus, in order to see if there was any error at all, not indeed in matters of faith or morals, but in matters of discipline. That there could be no error in matters of faith or morals—in the Catholic understanding of the term—must be here taken for granted since the Church's freedom from error is abundantly demonstrated, and since the point under discussion is altogether outside the scope of infallibility.

"Janus," the author of "The Pope and the Council," may put the objection in its popular form.

"1. During the devastations of Goths and Lombards, there was "a collapse of all learning and theology, which distorted the dog- "matic tradition. Since the eighth century the ordinations of cer- "tain Popes began to be annulled, and bishops and priests ordained "them were compelled to be reordained. Constantine II. (769) is "a case in point. He obtained the primacy by force of arms. He "was deposed and all his ordinations were pronounced invalid."

"2. The strongest case is that of Formosus, whose ordinations "were rejected. Popes and Synods decided in glaring contradic- "tion to one another on the question of the validity of the ordi- "nations, and in Rome all sure knowledge on the doctrine was lost.

"3. Since the eighth century ordinations which were valid ac- "cording to immutable laws had been declared null at Rome.

"4. The increase of simony had given occasion to Popes to annul "a number of ordinations at a Roman Synod. This was based on "the double error that simony was heresy and that heresy made "the ordination invalid."

In answer to these objections Hergenrother says that "reordi- "nations prove nothing against infallibility, because no kind of dog- "matic decisions is involved therein, and we do not understand "the doctrine as Janus interprets it. The question was for a long "time undecided, and many harsh expressions are to be construed "only in the sense of illicitness, not of invalidity."

To confirm this last statement one might refer to passages where Popes seem to insist upon the absolute nullity of orders given by heretics. But it would at the same time be necessary to prove that their condemnation extended beyond the mere licitness of such ordinations and the canonical recognition of them as to rank and

exercise, before we could partially agree with Janus. Furthermore, as a reconciliatory rite existed for the purpose of reinstallation into ecclesiastical dignities which had been uncanonically obtained, we must understand this reinstallation in the sense of a bestowal of jurisdiction or a recognition of such orders "in foro Ecclesiæ."

But to return to the case of Formosus. His early history and the manner of his accession to the papacy must be briefly touched upon, because his adversaries, in rejecting his ordinations, appeal to his uncanonical election, and to his vow to refrain from offering himself as a candidate. In the year 873 he was sent as legate by Pope John VIII. into Germany and France; a sufficient testimony to his worth. In 876 a Synod under the same Pope in the basilica S. Dei Genitricis (ad martyres) declared Formosus degraded, excommunicated, anathematised, unless he repented of and amended his course of action. The reason of this, it is asserted, was that having been sent into Bulgaria by Nicolas I. (858-867) he had imposed on King Michael an oath to decline to accept any other bishop from the Holy See; that, furthermore, desirous of getting the papacy, he had won over many adherents by devious methods; that he had deserted his parish without leave, and had engaged in conspiracies against the Emperor Charles. On the 21st of April, in the same year, the French and Germans were apprised of this decision and advised to refrain from intercourse with Formosus. In June another Synod, consisting of twenty-nine bishops, was assembled in the Church of St. Peter. In this Synod Formosus and his partisans were condemned to perpetual excommunication, because they had refused to perform their penance or to show themselves contrite. On the 14th of September a Synod at Troyes confirmed the judgment already passed in the previous Roman Synod, and Formosus, it is said, took an oath never to return to Rome to plead his cause nor in any way to try to regain the position due to his sacred orders. This is the oath to which his adversaries appeal; but it must be observed in passing, that of the nature of this oath or of its occasion our knowledge is at least very doubtful, since it is not certain that any Synod whatsoever exacted it. The Synod which is quoted, or rather the session of the Synod, was not known to have been held until Richter, in 1843, discovered it in the codex of Mersbourg. Jaffé adds that the acts of this session are open to serious doubt. Hefele confirms this by pointing out that the signatures appended to it do not agree with the signatures affixed to the Synod of Troyes; in fact some of them are manifest errors. To quote only a few instances: the signature of Bennon appears instead of that of Otram as Archbishop of

Vienna; that of Heldebold instead of Ingelwins for Paris; that of Bodo instead of Ottulf for Troyes; that of Isaac instead of Anselm for Limoges, and about ten other mistakes in a short list of thirty-five. But what is far more damaging is that some bishops appeared to have signed as bishops who were either raised to their sees some time after the Synod took place or who were actually dead some time before. Thus Erpuin, who died in 871; Alto, in 870, are cited for a Synod in 878. This would seem to show that both the fact and the occasion of the oath are doubtful. Later writers assert that the oath was extorted from Formosus; however this may be, Marinus I. (882-884) released Formosus from whatever oath he had taken, as Auxilius and others tell us: "Out of compassion it was decreed that Formosus should be freed from the oath." Formosus now resumed his episcopal dignity, and became famous for sanctity and influence; so much so that he was the actual consecrator of Pope Stephen V. (885-891), and as his influence increased he was considered worthy of being himself acclaimed as Pope by the majority of the Roman clergy and people, and recognized as such by the most remote nations. Luitprandus asserts that the election was the result of a noisy faction; others condemn Formosus for cupidity and ambition and violence; Auxilius denies this, whilst the "Insectiva in Romam" tells us: "Though he (Formosus) resisted thy invitation, O Rome, and though he clung to his altar, Thou didst drag him from it perforce, and with hymns of joy didst enthrone him on the highest of all thrones, the Apostolic seat, showing obeisance to him, blessing whomsoever he blessed and cursing whomsoever he cursed." Luitprandus, however, gives quite another version, for he says that Sergius was to be the new Pope, and that it was he who was dragged from his altar and was expelled from the city. Auxilius seems to be the better authority, for reasons which will appear.

With the actual reign of Formosus (891-896) we have at present nothing to do, nor with the reign of his successor, who survived his election a few weeks only. It is well ascertained that the public and private life of Formosus as Pope was as blameless as his later episcopal life; all except his political rivals agree in extolling his sanctity which, it is said, was confirmed by God himself, who did not disdain to show His pleasure in His servant by working miracles. Flodardus, Pseudo-Luitprandus and Sigebertus are also loud in their praises of Formosus.

But difficulties now arise. We are confronted with a very unfortunate episode in history, if indeed all that has been asserted must be taken without reserve. Successive Popes—Stephen VI,

John IX, Sergius III, undo all that their predecessors had decreed as inviolable. Successive Synods contradicted one another. Acts of Synods were burned; Popes were condemned by Popes; bishops were degraded; the papal throne was as insecure and the lives of its occupants as much in jeopardy as was the case in the most violent periods of secular history. The contention of our adversaries, whether they are of the number of those who do not understand the real question at issue, or of those who confound the real question with one of dogma, is that Popes must surely have been wrong in condemning valid ordinations. But we ask, was all this action due to ignorance of the Church's teaching, or was it due to a want of perception of the difference between licitness and validity? Was the teaching of the Church as explicit then as it is now? But in order to form some idea of the state of the Church, and to see how difficult it is to assent to the conclusions of various writers, it will be well to examine such words of the Popes and Synods and other authorities as bear on the subject.

Pope Stephen VI (896-897) held a Synod at Rome in January, 897, before which the corpse of Formosus, dragged from its tomb, was set up, decked out in episcopal robes, and was put on its trial, a mock one to be sure, for neither the corpse nor its advocates —who remained discreetly dumb—vouchsafed any reply to the leading questions proposed. It was condemned and excommunicated; three of its fingers were cut off and it was thrown into the Tiber. The ordinations, it is said, which Formosus had performed were declared null and void. We have three authorities for these facts. I say three, because I am dealing chiefly with the reordination question, and authorities who are quoted are all reducible to the three, whose words, as we shall see, leave scope for a variety of interpretations. These three are, in order of time and importance:

1. The acts of a Council held under Pope John IX in 898.
2. The writings of Auxilius.
3. The Antapodosis, a history of the lives of emperors and kings by Luitprandus.

It might seem ungracious to weaken the force of the testimony of one of these three. However, it is very necessary to premise that where Luitprandus varies from the other two the presumption is not in his favour. Later historians are convinced of this; earlier writers, as Sigebertus, Baronius and Natalis Alexander are so often indebted to this author that they must be examined with care. An author like Dean Milman finds in Luitprandus the material for a tragical presentment of facts; and though he acquaints us with the source of his statements, it is not advisable to attach first rate

importance to everything that Luitprandus says. In confirmation of this attitude towards the author of the Antapodosis I may state that Hefele accuses him of serious inaccuracy and of a pronounced tendency to misrepresentation, for Damberger and Duret have proved such to be the case. However, taking Luitprandus as he stands, we shall find that the current conclusions based upon his words have to be modified.

He began his work in 958, about sixty years after the death of Formosus. He says that some time after Formosus had held the papacy he was grievously afflicted by the Romans, and in consequence invited Arnulfus of Germany to Rome, who in revenge for insults offered to the Pope, ordered many of the Romans to be beheaded. Whether Arnulfus was freely admitted into the city or had to lay siege to it is not clear. The party of the Roman people who had tried to elect the deacon Sergius in opposition to Formosus had remained at enmity with the reigning pontiff. Luitprandus then relates the story of the mock tribunal, and concludes, "cunctosque quos ipse (Formosus) ordinaverat, gradu proprio depositos iterum ordinavit." Now it is not easy to determine the exact meaning of the phrase of Luitprandus, for the words, "reduced to their proper rank," or, "degraded from their rank," may be variously interpreted. That he here expresses the fact of real reordination in the strictest sense is not evident. He himself, however, would seem to have considered the orders given by Formosus as strictly valid, and this, observe, in the very heat of the controversy during the time when "all sure knowledge was lost in Rome." That he thought any degradation to be worthy of blame must be clear from his subsequent remarks: "How wicked this action was, you may gather from the fact that those who had received Apostolic benediction from the traitor Judas were not deprived (degraded) even after the betrayal and the suicide, unless indeed their own vicious actions contaminated them; because such benediction, bestowed by Christ's ministers, is not given by the visible but by the invisible priest." Again, at the end of his work on Otho I, Emperor, he tells us that Pope Benedict V, in presence of a Synod held by Leo VIII and Otho, was deprived of his pontifical and priestly rank, but allowed to retain in exile the dignity of his diaconate. Whether the fact be true or not,—for Severinus Binius first of all says that this work is wrongly ascribed to Luitprandus; secondly, that its author is hostile to Benedict; thirdly, that the alleged constitution of this Synod is a fiction,—it remains clear that the author, Luitprandus let it be supposed, could clearly and sharply distinguish between orders in themselves and in their functions. But

whatever may be thought of this pseudo-Luitprandus, the words of the genuine Luitprandus cited above are all important; 'gradu proprio depositos,' a degradation of some kind or other may very well regard the loss of some extrinsic dignity or jurisdiction, for if the bishop or priest had been validly but illicitly ordained and was, therefore, exercising illicit jurisdiction, he might very well be said to be unfrocked or degraded, and the bestowal of licit jurisdiction, especially if accompanied by any rite, might be called, though not strictly, a reordination. Furthermore, in recognizing a benediction given by Judas, and branding as a wicked act any degradation of those previously ordained—unless it was due to their personal demerits—Luitprandus may be considered to mean that Formosus could and did ordain, and that to deprive the priests ordained by him of their title to priestly rank or character is in the highest degree worthy of censure. At the same time, however, his words literally mean that Pope Stephen degraded the Formosan priests, though that such an action necessarily implies a denial of their orders is not immediately evident. Stephen may have intended to deprive these priests of jurisdiction only in order that he himself might sanction their functions.

But even if it be admitted that the action was directed against the validity of orders, it must be manifest that Stephen and his partisans were beside themselves, and if they really did the worst that can be supposed, acted very hastily. It would assuredly be absurd to regard this action of a political enemy as involving any breach in continuity of doctrine or as polluting in any sense the pure stream of tradition. Are we not justified in regarding Stephen as either ignorant of the question at issue or misled by his court? It is not necessary to interpret his deed in its worst possible light.

Before weighing the evidence of our second authority it may be well to glance at the short reign of Theodore in so far as it bears upon the case. In a synod held in 897 it was stated that Pope Theodore restored those priests and bishops, "quos Stephanus secum in ecclesia vestiri prohibuit," the literal meaning of which is, "whom Stephen forbade to officiate or to be clothed, or to wear the sacred vestments along with himself." These are the words reported to us by Auxilius, the champion of the Formosan cause, and therefore we may presume that they are not weakened in their purport in passing through his hands. Now there is not the remotest hint here of Stephen's implying the invalidity of the ordinations which he refused to recognize. As far as words go it may have been a wholly disciplinary measure; such words may, with every propriety of language, be used for a deprivation of juris-

diction. Furthermore, as this Pope Theodore and John, his successor, not only recognized Formosan ordinations but published to the world their esteem of Formosus—for Theodore conveyed the body of Formosus in state to the basilica of St. Peter's and gave it a decent sepulchre, whilst John publicly ratified in a synod those ordinations which Stephen condemned—it is gratuitous to say that all sure knowledge on the matter of orders had departed from Rome. Subsequently, it is true, Sergius III condemned Formosus, but on what grounds it is not easy to discover. In the absence of any more certain evidence than the violent language of compilers it is rash to draw any conclusion. But here again, as in the case of Stephen, the action of Sergius is the action of an inveterate rival and is therefore robbed of any force in establishing a thesis against the Church. Sergius may readily be thought to have been not a whit behind Stephen, who certainly forced several bishops to fix their signatures to his condemnatory synod. This fact is explicitly stated in the capitula of a synod under John IX, for we read that several bishops confessed to having been present at Stephen's synod and to having signed under pressure (coacte.) If such a synod were declaring the deliberate and mature judgment of the Church, it is hard to see why any signatures should be extorted.

But to return to our second authority, the Synod under John IX. We wish to find out if the words of this Synod imply that Pope Stephen condemned the ordinations of Formosus as invalid. The first capitulum of John's Synod condemns Stephen's Synod; the words are: "Synodum tempore piæ recordationis [is this a formula of etiquette?] sexti Stephani papæ celebratam, in quam venerabile corpus Formosi venerandi papæ de sepultura violata per terram tractum est . . . . . penitus abdicamus." We entirely respect, it says, that Synod which was held under Stephen, of holy memory, and before which the body of Formosus was dragged. This capitulum, it must be observed, does not ascribe the action to Stephen; it does not even imply that he had given orders for the brutal act. The second capitulum extends forgiveness to those who were forced to be present at Stephen's Synod. The third declares that Formosus was translated from Porto to Rome by reason of his virtuous life, but forbids the case to be quoted as a precedent. The fourth restores to their rank and orders all those priests, deacons, subdeacons and others, who having been ordained by Formosus, "pro quorumdam libitu temere *defecti sunt*" were rashly degraded at the caprice of some individuals. The words 'defecti sunt' are all important; they may mean a withdrawal of jurisdiction only. The

fifth capitulum declared that the present Synod adopts the practice of the African Council, which had forbidden reordination, rebaptism and translation. It is noteworthy that after the bare mention of reordination—which is not defined—the rest of the capitulum concerns translation from see to see. Now, when we come to the ninth we have a confirmation of our conclusions based on the first capitulum. It was seen that there the action of exhuming was not ascribed to Stephen; the ninth goes far to exculpate him altogether, for it tells us that the violators of the tomb of Formosus had entered into a conspiracy to seize the treasure and accordingly dragged his body out and cast it into the Tiber." Not a word about the Synod or how the corpse was brought there! Did Stephen desire to get a hidden treasure? Did he give orders that the body should be thrown into the river? It is hard to say. Have historians perhaps been confounding the action of Stephen—whatever it may have been—with the action of these treasure seekers, and have they imputed to him the guilt of a brutal action of which he was only a passive spectator? The student of this Council will find it hard to draw any conclusion; he will find it impossible to agree with all that is said against Stephen. The main fact certainly stands out clearly enough; the wonder is that if Stephen were guilty of everything that is alleged, the Synod did not more explicitly say so. It would have been a strong argument against him.

We may add to this Synod another held at Ravenna in 898, which confirms what had been decided in the above mentioned Roman Synod; but no additional weight can be given by it to any conclusions. We may observe, however, against "Janus" that this Synod of Ravenna decreed that the Roman Synod should be considered decisive; "perpetualiter stabilita servetur," it must be held inviolable for ever. This does not favour an absence of sure knowledge in Rome. As a confirmation of the statement of Morinus, that the historians of this period are to be read with caution it is well to call attention to the error of Sigebertus, who, in his chronicle under the year 907, ascribes the action against Formosus to Sergius instead of to Stephen; he was doubtless misled by Luitprandus, who confounds the names though retaining the correct dates. But the story has grown under the touch of the later chronicle, for even the unfortunate corpse is not only dragged out by the Pope's orders but is beheaded. The indignities become more shocking as time goes on.

Between Sergius III and John IX we have the three short reigns of Benedict IV (900-903), Leo V (903) and Christopher (903-904.) It is necessary to mention these reigns and to examine,

in brief, what is said about Serguis III, to add weight to our contention that affairs were in so unsettled a state as to make it unfair to judge of the Church's persistent teaching in the light of some incidental action of a Pope like Stephen or Sergius. Our conviction will also be strengthened by apparently reliable testimony that Sergius was not so abandoned as he is represented to have been, though in proposing this testimony it is not our present purpose to rehabilitate the character of any Pope, but rather to correct, as far as possible, the hastily formed conclusions of so many writers, who catch at anything and everything that can tend to diminish the Catholic reverence for the papacy. Benedict IV had been massacred, it is said, by the party of Berengarius. Leo V survived his own election by four weeks; he was thrown into prison and was succeeded by the violent Christopher. Six months later he was in his turn cast into prison, where he died. Sergius now seized the chair of Peter, for which he had twice been a candidate, once when Formosus was elected and again at the election of John IX, and had spent seven years in exile. Conflicting accounts have come down to us concerning him, some of them very much to his discredit. But Hefele has shown that some insinuations have no foundation whatever; indeed in this as in many cases where the lives of Popes are in question, the testimony of either side must be carefully weighed. Two examples of favorable testimonies are Flodoardus and the inscription on his tomb. The first states that he had been elected Pope, had been rejected and exiled, but had afterwards returned at the invitation of the Roman people; the second tells us that John IX had ousted Sergius, who after seven years spent in exile, returned to Rome and was invited to be Pope at the urgent request of the people. The concluding words of the epitaph are:

"Amat pastor agmina cuncta simul," the shepherd loves the whole of his flock. This summary review will help us to realize the state of Rome, distracted by political parties, the prize of every powerful emperor, more like its ancient self when the Roman Emperors held it in thraldom than like the centre of peace and unity, which was a feature of its best days and which is a characteristic of its present life.

Our third and last authority is Auxilius. He was ordained by Formosus about 894, and wrote two books in defence of the ordinations of Formosus and one on his cause. The first work is edited by Morinus, who takes a somewhat lenient view of Stephen and Sergius. The theory of ordinations, he says, was in a transition stage, for it was not at all clear then that the rite should not be

repeated. Many of the reasons alleged by Auxilius are beside the point. May not the action of Stephen, he asks, have been the outcome of a too rigorous idea of the Church's discipline and of an excessive zeal for its purity? The controversy, he maintains, does not bear upon faith, but is wholly taken up with the two questions, was the promotion of Formosus canonical, and could a deposed bishop validly ordain? The learned oratorian then proceeds to point out what must be considered as errors of Auxilius. But if he has corrected this author in many particulars and warns us to read him carefully, his own argument on ordinations suffers by the advice, as he bases the whole of his contention on Luitprandus, Sigebertus and Auxilius, whom he generally takes quite literally. We must, therefore, take Auxilius exactly as he is if we quote him in any sense as an authority—that is, of course, after excluding palpable mistakes—and we may not test the accuracy of his words by appealing to any other writer. What precisely we are now seeking is whether from the works of this priest of Formosus, who must surely be considered to have intimately known the facts of his time, we can gather that Pope Stephen regarded Formosan ordinations as absolutely invalid, and whether there was any sure knowledge on the subject of orders during this period. If the testimony of Luitprandus was vague—though it might be quoted, but not with decretorial force for either side, and if the words of John's Synod, though less vague, could with less ease be quoted for the view that Stephen did not regard the validity but the licitness of Formosan ordinations when he condemned them, the third testimony of Auxilius is hostile to the conclusions already drawn. If then we are to take him literally we are driven to say that Stephen must have condemned the Formosan priests to the extent of regarding their ordinations invalid. But after all, this may be regarded as an influence where the weight of evidence varies with the point of view. The opposite inference might be drawn and has been drawn by some. But let us examine the original words, the conclusion notwithstanding. Of course this must always be taken as certainly proved, that the first two testimonies, no less than the third—as we shall see in the investigation—clearly show that there was very definite knowledge on the point amongst a large—probably the larger and more thoughtful—section of bishops, priests and historians; so that the contentions of "Janus" with regard to infallibility and sure knowledge are without any foundation.

In the sixth chapter of his first book Auxilius shows that the Nicene Council in condemning as "irritum," of no avail, void, illicit, invalid(?), the translation from one Church to another of bishop,

presbyter, or deacon, does not touch the ordinations which a translated bishop may have performed. The proof is in the very text of the canon, for it says: "If anyone attempt a translation, *this* shall be considered altogether *'irritum.'*" That is to say, the translation itself is invalid or illicit. In the seventeenth chapter he states that reordination is no less absurd than rebaptism; that, as in the example of Acacius, the ministrations of an unworthy priest do hurt to no one except the priest himself. Consecration is very different from reconciliation. In the twenty-eighth chapter he says that if the ordinations of Formosus were invalid, then Italy was for twenty years without the Christian religion. The 'Invectiva in Romam,' a work of uncertain authorship, goes yet further in declaring that Constantinople, Sicily, all Italy, Gaul, Germany, cry out against the supposition. The result of this invalidity, if it were a fact, would have been, it states, the loss of the bodies and souls of nearly all the world during a space of thirty years; multitudes of men, countless as the stars of heaven, would have gone to hell. In the twenty-ninth chapter the fault—if there were any—of the ordination of Formosus himself is ascribed to the Roman people, who chose him to be Pope. In the last chapter Auxilius ventures to hope for a general council which may settle the question.

The second book, entitled "Infensor et defensor," has for its preface a letter to a bishop, Leo by name, who, like Auxilius, had been ordained by Formosus, and who had been urgently pressed to allow himself to be reordained. Leo, however, after consulting many learned men, determined to stand by his first ordination. In the first chapter Auxilius sets himself the task of proving that the ordinations of Formosus are probably valid and legitimate, even if Formosus himself had not been duly (rite) ordained. In the first sentence of this chapter we find an illustration of that technical language which has more than once been misunderstood, as witness the amusing blunder of Dr. Shirley, which Fr. Bridgett exposed. We are told: "Formosus propria relicta uxore aliam abstulit," Formosus deserted his wife and took a second; but Auxilius hastens to explain, "hoc est, relicto episcopatu," that is, he abandoned his episcopal see. To establish the validity of the Formosan ordinations, he maintains that this Pope was as capable of ordaining validly as were Acacius, Liberius, Vigilius, Anatolius, Bonosus, whose priests were in some cases admitted without a fresh ordination. Reordination was expressly condemned by Pope Gregory. In the tenth chapter he says that those who submitted to a reordination ought to be excluded from the sacred ministry.

In the twentieth, that Formosus was reconciled by Apostolic authority, for the oath which he had taken had been unjustly extorted from him. In the twenty-first he rehearses the names of many priests who were deposed but were afterwards admitted to reconciliation without a second ordination, as St. John Chrysostom, Marcellus of Ancyra, Cyril of Jerusalem, Photinus. In the twenty-second, that God alone is to judge whether Formosus seized the papacy from cupidity. In the twenty-fifth he quotes Chalcedon as stating that a translation is to be punished by deprivation of communion until the cleric return to his own church. Pope Leo condemned such clerics to the loss of their sees. Formosus, however, was elected Pope for the sake of the Church's welfare. In the twenty-sixth, that when Formosus was enthroned as Pope he did not receive a second episcopal ordination, but only an increase of Apostolic dignity. We asked, says Auxilius, those who were present and they declared that it is falsely alleged that Formosus received an imposition of hands: "We merely led him to the Apostolic See and there enthroned him with fitting supplications." In the twenty-seventh, that the slanderous testimony of the enemies of Formosus is worthless. In the twenty-ninth he rejects the idea that the bishops at the Council of Ravenna were bribed to give their assent to the ordinations of Formosus.

There is another work ascribed to Auxilius, the "Libellus," where the same matter is put into a different form. The following points alone are of any importance:

1. It is incredible that Rome—the embodied wisdom of the whole world—should have elected an excommunicate for her Supreme Head. Therefore, Formosus must have been absolved.

2. Formosus took an oath never to return to Rome. True; but "whether is it better for one man to keep an oath and for the head of the world to be ruined; or that one man should exceed in words and so save his race and country?"

3. If the first of a series of acts is "irritum," illicit, invalid(?), it does not follow that subsequent acts which flow from it are also "irrita," illicit, invalid.

4. If a baptized person does not lose his baptism—even if he be cut off from the Church—how can one who has been consecrated, admitted to orders—even if he be excommunicated—lose the efficacy of his imposition of hands? This is an obscure sentiment of the author. Whether he intends to refer to a bishop's character or to a sacerdotal character alone, it is not easy to determine. From his subsequent words it would seem that he is speaking of priesthood alone. His contention, therefore, is "once a priest al-

ways a priest." Here, therefore, he takes for granted that the Formosan priests were validly ordained and rejects all reordination. If, however, he is speaking of the episcopal character, his conclusion is no less certain, for then he maintains that every bishop retains the power of ordaining which he got at consecration, and the priests of such a bishop are in no case to be reordained.

5. If the gift of baptism, a gift of the Holy Ghost, cannot be destroyed, how can ordination, which is no less a gift of the Holy Ghost, be destroyed? Therefore, as one who has been baptized cannot receive a second baptism, so one who has been consecrated cannot be reconsecrated. Here the author is certainly speaking of priesthood and maintains that reordination is absolutely useless. He takes as proved, therefore, that the ordinations of Formosus were valid, and insinuates that strict reordination had been practised.

6. A heretic does not lose his episcopal "jus" or right—or rather we should say his power—of performing ordinations. How then could Formosus have lost this power?

The argument of the whole book is then summed up by the author thus: Formosus, it is said, was excommunicated. If so, he was certainly absolved. But he could not go from see to see. Granted; but it does not follow that, because the translation was illicit (invalid?), therefore the subsequent acts were also invalid. If Pope Innocent is quoted against Formosus, we on our side can quote Anastasius, Leo and Gregory, who declare that ordinations by heretics are by no means invalid. An objection was raised to the effect that Formosus could not give what he had not received. Against this we have proved that as baptism is not taken from evil-doers, so the gift of the Holy Spirit, which is once given by imposition of hands, is also not taken away from those who err. But more than this; do you not see that one who has been absolved can both consecrate, ordain and perform all his episcopal functions? You admit the baptisms performed by these Formosan priests. Why do you not admit their ordinations, for it is the one sacrament and the one gift of the Holy Ghost? In conclusion, the author uses five modes of the syllogism to prove that every individual bishop has the same power as the whole body of bishops —doubtless in the matter of ordaining.

The last work that is sometimes attributed to Auxilius is the "Invectiva in Romam," an imprecation on Rome for all that she had done against her saintly Pope. The facts and inferences in the main agree with what we have already seen. Though somewhat exaggerated, this short work disposes of the contention of Formosan adversaries that Formosus had nothing and therefore

could give nothing. It is, therefore, mainly engaged in establishing the validity of Formosan ordinations, and bases its chief argument on the fact that the translation in the case of Formosus had abundant precedents and could not invalidate his actions as Pope. Though not explicitly stating that reordination was practised, it does state this fact by implication, for it proves that since Formosus was validly elected Pope, he therefore had the power of really giving whatever he is represented as having given invalidly. Therefore his ordinations were valid. There can be no reasonable doubt that the author thought, with many others, that the validity being once established there was no need for a reordination.

It remains to point out in brief the legitimate conclusions from the above evidence. There are two. First, that the evidence goes to show on the whole that there was an abundance of certain and correct knowledge on the point of dogma involved in ordinations, both in Rome and in various parts of Italy. This must be clear in the first place, from the decided action of Popes Theodore and John IX in restoring Formosan priests, and from the language of the Council held at Rome in 898 and confirmed by the Synod of Ravenna. It is not reasonable to suppose that in spite of an argument deducible from the action of Stephen and Sergius, the knowledge on the question of ordinations was, generally speaking, very vague and immature, and it is as unreasonable to say that the sentiments of two such Popes and a packed Synod represent the sum total of knowledge in Rome, as it would be to maintain that the feeling of the English people and of the English bishops and lawyers was fairly represented by the packed Parliaments of the reformation period and by the small minority of subservient ecclesiastics. Secondly, we have the explicit phrases of Auxilius who wrote about the matter somewhat decisively and lived in the very midst of the controversy. Thirdly, Luitprandus, born about 920, and bishop of Cremona about 962, shows that he understood the matter perfectly. In the fourth place we can appeal to Leo, bishop of Nola, to whom Auxilius wrote the prefatory letter mentioned above; if this bishop had any uncertain knowledge,—which of course is not the least demonstrable, but seems to be taken for granted—he quickly resolved his doubts and stood firm. Fifthly, the men of learning—both Franks and Italians—to whom Leo appealed, spoke with such certainty that he was ready to refuse reordination at the risk of what doubtless must have been great personal inconvenience. Sixthly, both Pseudo-Luitprandus and the author of the "Invectiva in Romam" are quite definite in their language, which points to decided views on the matter. In the

seventh place John VIII (872) in his seventy-fifth letter degrades Sergius, an eunuch, who had been uncanonically made bishop by a certain George, "qui sibi episcopi nomen falso usurpat," who falsely usurped the title of bishop; in his seventy-ninth letter and in his one hundred and ninety-ninth, when speaking of the absolution of Photius, he clearly shows that he knew what illicit ordinations were. Again, Stylian, bishop of Neocesarea, in a letter to Pope Stephen V (885), speaks of Photius as "illegitimately ordained by schismatics." These are sufficient to establish the first conclusion, notwithstanding some few expressions here and there which could imply an opposite sense. May we not say, however, with Hergenrother, that harsh expressions may be construed of illicitness and not of invalidity? But even if this be not granted, we may readily concede that probably some few ordinations were thought to be invalid because bestowed by degraded bishops, just as ordinations bestowed by heretical bishops were not at all times and by everyone looked upon as valid. How does this affect the almost universal conviction that the contrary was the sound doctrine? Should an expression in a private letter of a Pope be construed at all times to represent the general theological knowledge? To give a specimen of a harsh phrase, Formosus himself, in a letter to Stylian (892) says, "Nil potuit Photius præter damnationem quem habuit, per impositionem obliquæ manus, et damnationem præbuit. Quomodo dignitatem potuit accipere qui particeps factus est condemnato?" Photius, he says, could bestow nothing but condemnation. How could the accomplice of one who had been condemned receive any dignity or rank from such a one?

The second conclusion is that the balance of the evidence is in favor of the fact of reordination, and in such a way that to deny that strict reordination was practised would be to do violence to the testimony of Auxilius; to set aside the more obvious interpretation of Pope John's Council, and to derive one legitimate conclusion from Luitprandus but to refuse to admit a legitimate contrary. The reasons for so saying are as follows: Luitprandus speaks of a degradation; this may be merely disciplinary, but is not necessarily so. The Council condemns, in one and the same canon, reordination and rebaptism without qualification; the more obvious sense is that real reordination had taken place. Auxilius is at such pains to show that the Formosan orders were valid—not, be it observed, that Formosus had the right to give jurisdiction—that we must suppose him to be writing against those who declined to recognize the validity and who accordingly reordained.

But it does not in any sense follow that there is at stake any

vital question as to error in faith or morals or dogma which affected more than a few individuals. Tradition could well remain intact, and the Church's teaching constant, in spite of the above practice. Still less, as far as the evidence goes, can we say that there was no sure knowledge on the point. It was abundant and very decided. Consequently the twofold contention of "Janus" falls to the ground; we may admit, to a great extent, that what he alleges as facts were facts indeed; we deny his conclusions.

H. Davis, S. J.

St. Beuno's College.

## THE CAPITALIST AND HIS POINT OF VIEW.[1]

THE first step to be made in any attempt at true social reform should be the determination of the conditions which demand change. Exaggerations must be reduced to meet facts, the blindness of partisanship must be removed, phrases currently used to give expression to a traditional feeling of injustice or discontent must be examined and recast to fit changed conditions. The power, intensity and activity of social movements come from feeling; but feeling is not noted for judgment, accuracy or caution. This corrective work must be done by reason and it is welcomed with bad grace. Goethe is reported to have said that the public is seldom, if ever, mistaken about the broad truth and hardly ever right about details. As a rule, then, we may trust a social movement in its general character, but we must beware of the danger there is in its disregard for accuracy, its impatience of restraint and its failure to count consequences before acting. Much harm has been done to the cause of social reform in our time by the faults of the social movement. Invective, blind exaggeration, misunderstandings have abounded on all sides; capitalist and laborer and public being culpable, suffering in like manner and yet unwilling to desert the emotional and sentimental stage of the

[1] The report of the U. S. Senate Committee created in 1883 to investigate the relations of Capital and Labor in the United States, has been of great service in the preparation of this article. Much assistance was received also from the Report of the Chicago Strike Commission, and from Walker's and Marshall's Economics. The reader familiar with the last named works will notice here and there a phrase borrowed or a thought adapted for which it seemed hardly necessary to indicate a reference. For the sake of brevity, the report of the Senate Committee is referred to as Senate Report, vol., etc. It was to have consisted of five volumes, though but four were published. Conditions of industry in the United States alone are kept in view throughout the article.

movement for the rational. This is to be noticed in the position occupied by the so-called capitalist in the social question. The word is used in a very loose way and the capitalist class has been receiving its quota of abuse now for many a long day. There is nothing more striking in the whole varied range of the phenomena of the labor movement than the position of the capitalist. The trend of popular sympathy is with labor. Workingmen are everywhere regarded with sympathy if not affection. They are looked upon as victims of a system which neither distributes opportunity wisely nor rewards merit justly. For them life is hopeless and the world heartless. The very wealth which, it is claimed, they alone create is heaped, mountain high, under the exclusive control of a few "lordly fellow worms," to use Burns' expression, and they sit in the shadow and pine away. Calyle spoke a thought very widely shared in his words: "Hardly entreated brother. For us was thy back so bent, for us were thy straight limbs and fingers so deformed; thou wert our Conscript on whom the lot fell and fighting our battles, thou wert so marred."[2]

On the contrary the capitalist is much blamed. He is looked upon as the enemy of humanity. He is the froward child of fortune, enjoying ease and luxury at the expense of his fellow men. The presumption is in all cases against him just as it is in all cases in favor of the laborer. The capitalist has few, if any, defenders; no one to write his defense in words that burn into the heart and remain; no poet or prophet to call him brother, to sing or speak to him the message that consoles. And why not? He has reason to complain, to cry out for deliverance from the conditions which surround him. Bent back and deformed limbs are not the only deformities by which human nature may be disfigured; nor is poverty the only evil, physical exertion the only labor in life. It were far from surprising did we find capitalists banded together into associations whose purpose was to put an end to the system in which we live. It is not necessary to be a laboring man in order to become a logical socialist, if indeed logic and socialism ever meet. An analysis of conditions from this point of view may have some interest and be of some service. In attempting it I mean to make no plea for the capitalist as opposed to the laborer. My plea is that the capitalist be understood. His place in industry, his characteristics, principles and aims; his point of view and the influences which affect it; all these must be known if we would do him justice. If knowing them and appreciating them rightly we still condemn him and give sympathy to labor

[2] Sartor Resartus, p. 172.

no thinking man can complain. We should first know, then judge. My purpose is merely to help the reader to know.

The term Capitalist causes confusion in that its application is too broad at one time and too narrow at another. It is too broad when one says that a man owning a large amount of money is a capitalist, whether or not his funds are engaged in industry of any kind; too narrow when the term is confined to those alone who are actually engaged in industry to the exclusion of others whose money is invested in industrial enterprises; altogether wrong when it is said that the capitalist is the oppressor of labor. Mr. Croker was asked during his recent examination before the Mazet Committee: "Are you a capitalist?" He answered: "What do you mean?" The question was changed: "Worth a million dollars?" "O, no," was his reply. Again, a bank cashier testifying before the Senate Committee in 1884 defined a capitalist as "one who has money at interest." This confusion is not found among economists or those who understand the industrial structure of society. Any one who possesses capital is a capitalist, and capital is wealth employed in the production of wealth. All money invested in business of any kind is capital, whether in the factory, railroad or village grocery store. Stockholders in street railways, factories or department stores are capitalists as well as is the President of the Standard Oil Company; the laborer who owns shares in the factory which employs him is one as well as is the chief owner. The differences, vast though they be, are only of degree with consequent inequality of industrial power. The popular meaning of the word is therefore misleading, not to say wrong, and it should be corrected. An analysis of the conditions of industry will show us how that is to be done.[8]

When we step into a store and purchase an easy chair we rarely allow our thoughts go beyond the question of comfort, style and price. We may compare prices, hesitate about the choice of color or the upholstering, but no more. Yet we perform the last act of a long series marked by bewildering complexity, a series reaching out possibly beyond the confines of our country; one which touched ten thousand lives and saw, perhaps, more than one unwritten tragedy. There is the retailer from whom we buy; the railroad company which brought his stock from the wholesale houses with which he deals. They, in turn, with all their questions of business, credit, sales, are in direct and constant relations with the factories of the country which produce the style of chair we

[8] The word Capitalist was retained in the title because of the meaning generally given to it. It would be more accurate to use the word Employer.

purchase. Each factory in turn has its problems of transportation of raw material and finished product; its relations with dealers in fuel, machinery, wood and screws; cloth and leather and brass. Each of these again is in constant and complex relation with unnumbered others, the dealer in wood probably having his buyers in Africa or South America. Intricate questions of cost, transportation, supply and demand appear at every step. Improvements in methods are being watched all along the line lest competitors secure advantages. Genius was employed in soliciting trade and fortunes spent in advertising; tariff and tax laws were watched carefully since they affect business so directly, and movements in popular demand were studied with a niceity which is little short of marvellous. Discrimination was exercised at every step in buying and selling and making terms; in so balancing credits and obligations that all danger was avoided while great elasticity was insured and popularity cared for. Every kind of economic institution appeared, the banker, broker, jobber, carrier, manufacturer and merchant each having an important function in that bewildering series. It is useless to attempt any further analysis, for the process by which the materials of the chair were brought together and the chair was produced touches practically every point of modern industry. But it is not necessary that we keep all this in mind. In studying the capitalist it will be sufficient to keep before us the process of manufacturing. It is central and typical. This will simplify our task though it will in no way do harm to the value of our conclusions.

The characteristic of modern industry is production on a large scale for a market practically open to the world of competitors. There is no restriction of liberty in engaging in industry if we except the system of limited license in some fields of production. Vast amounts of capital are required, extensive plant is necessary and large numbers of laboring men are congregated in one place for a particular kind of work. The world of competitors must be watched carefully, methods must be studied and knowledge of things and tendencies must be accurate. Immense purchases of raw stuff and machinery are made frequently and they must be made wisely, with due allowance for probable rise or fall in price and for possible change in demand. The nicest balance of a hundred forces must be maintained, for the possibilities of loss and gain are tremendous. Choices and decisions essential to success were never so difficult and numerous; the difference in the product between careful and inferior management never so great, toleration of the commonplace never so small. Production, therefore,

demands leaders of large capacity. They must be men with splendid powers of organization and genius for detail; with breadth of view, accuracy of judgment and superior generalship. Skilled knowers of men, they must marshal and direct great numbers of laborers, select responsible assistants in order to secure the best quality of work from the operatives and the largest output of product. They must so watch the general conditions of industry that they may be least affected by disturbances and may be able to run on full time or with as little loss as possible. It is necessary for them to be familiar with the things of the trade and forecast the movements of demand. They must be firm and prudent, knowing when and how to risk boldly, yet ever able to resist the seductions of danger and risk. They must know when, where and at what terms to sell; watch the progress of art, inventions and science inasmuch as it affects industry and its methods. Catastrophe comes from this source swiftly and unannounced at times. Before the war, printed delaines became unsalable in a night and later, Foster wools were thrown out of the market when a change in women's dress goods made soft French cashmere popular. An invention as well as a change in fashions may bring ruin if it revolutionizes the methods and reduce the cost of production.[4] In one word such are the conditions of industry nowadays that its leaders must be remarkable men; men of the highest type of intelligence, will and character from whom are demanded the highest forms of work and energy, upon whose shoulders rests the highest form of responsibility. Such men have come to the front in industrial life. Conditions have produced them and they mirror in their activity, disposition and achievements the very conditions out of which they spring. They are commonly called Employers, Captains of Industry, Entrepreneurs.[5] The ambiguous equivalent of this last name—Undertaker—is sometimes used. The marvellous organization of industry and the genius of its leaders have

[4] Mechanical improvements follow one another so rapidly that one is almost in doubt as to whether they are really beneficial to the industry for which they are intended. Their cheapening of processes antiquates machinery and methods almost before the latter have proved their utility." H. G. Kittredge, editor of the Textile World in the Forum, May, 1899, p. 358.

[5] Apropos of this attempt to sketch the characteristics of Employers, it may interest the reader to see Ruskin's strange classification of those who become rich and those who remain poor. "In a community regulated only by the laws of supply and demand and protected from open violence, the persons who become rich are, generally speaking, industrious, resolute, proud, covetous, prompt, methodical, sensible, unimaginative, insensitive and ignorant. The persons who remain poor are the entirely foolish, the entirely wise, the idle, the reckless, the humble, the thoughtful, the dull, the imaginative, the sensitive, the well informed, the improvident, the irregularly and impulsively wicked, the clumsy knave, the open thief and the entirely merciful, just and godly person." Ad Valorem, p. 70.

made possible a certain degree of relative stability and order in the industrial world. The perfect system of communication, report and conjecture now employed enables leaders in any branch of industry to know very accurately present conditions, probable developments and influences apt to affect prices, supply or demand. Interesting specimens of this may be found in the weekly trade reviews issued by Dunn & Co. and Bradstreet. In spite of this marvellous organization the genius of the Employer is constantly required and no substitute can be found for it.

But modern industry requires vast amounts of capital as well as men of genius. In general, few individuals have the capital necessary to conduct a great business alone; among those who do possess sufficient, the talent necessary for a great enterprise is rarely found. In a rough way, then, we might say that some men have the necessary talent, others the required capital. There is, in addition, an increasingly large number of individuals who have surplus wealth in small or large quantities. This surplus finds its way to banks and money centers from which the depositors receive a fixed rate of interest. Such central institutions readily lend their deposits to men of talent for industrial purposes. Again, stock companies are founded, shares are placed at a nominal figure and put on sale within easy reach of all who wish to invest; or partnerships may be formed, and through them abundant capital is made available.[6] In these ways modern industry places capital at the disposal of talent and talent is enabled to procure every advantage which ownership of capital offers. Talent finds capital easily, but capital is not always certain of finding talent. The enormous number of business failures, taking place annually in the United States, shows us to an extent,[7] the fate of capital without first class ability, and the swindles perpetrated every year tell the sad story of capital seeking talent too eagerly and trusting appearances without sufficient caution. We see, then, that bank depositors, silent partners, shareholders, investors and the like are all capitalists and consequently that the capitalist is not the central figure in industrial life. That important place is held by the

[6] For our purpose it is not necessary to hold to this distinction. Conditions and spirit are identical whether we treat of individuals or corporations. However, the reader may find statistics for Massachusetts showing proportions of individuals, corporations, and stockholders, etc., in the annual volume of Statistics of Manufacturers, issued by Bureau of Labor. A curious incident showing the attitude of the individual employer to the corporation may be found in Senate Report, vol. ii., p. 84, where the former is represented as having no sympathy for the latter.

[7] Only to an extent, for no human genius can avert all industrial disaster. Reports of failures are issued every week by Dunn & Co. and Bradstreet. As an illustration of the number, I note for the week from May 6 to 13, 210 failures in 1895, 265 in 1896, 251 in 1897, 250 in 1898 and 169 in 1899.

Employer. He is an intermediary between capital and labor. He discovers and seizes opportunity for profitable investment—a most important function in the development of a country's industry—he brings the elements of production together, adds genius to them and thus becomes master and leader. The profits of the enterprise are his. He, however, pays interest or dividends to capital and wages to labor; he keeps his equipment in good repair and the net profits are ordinarily his own. It is clear, now, that it is the Employer and not the Capitalist who is in conflict with labor; the latter need not and generally does not come into direct contact with the former. Even when the Employer is the Capitalist it is in his former capacity that he is in conflict with the workingmen whom he engages.[8] If we wish, then, to pass judgment on the Employer, it is necessary that we understand him, his point of view, his history. We must study him as an individual and as a member of a class. We will find all grades of the Employer talent in the industrial world, for we find there all stages of industry. The higher we go the greater the genius we discover. A merciless process of selection is going on constantly in which the fittest survive. Those who are lacking in ability, who show faulty judgment or relax in attention and diligence are mercilessly crushed in the fierce competitive struggle in which they participate.[9] The survivors are extraordinary, for there is no nepotism or favoritism here. Belonging originally to a select class they are advanced in it by processes which bring their faculties to an exceptional degree of development. Since they represent the highest stage of perfection of the talent of the Employer we can best understand the class by beginning our analysis here. After sketching the class characteristics we may make due allowance for those facts and conditions which seem to be in conflict with our analysis.

1. The employer is a man of great capacity, keenness and powers of organization. He is an able and successful business man in whom the business instinct predominates. His philosophy of life is affected by it; his perspective of life is adjusted in a way

[8] The Senate resolution of August 7, 1883, which created the Commission to Investigate the Relations of Capital and Labor, required that the Commission report on legislation "calculated to promote harmonious relations between Capitalists and Laborers." The law which created the Industrial Commission now at work is more accurate inasmuch as the Commission is directed to suggest laws which will "harmonize conflicting interests and be equitable to the Laborer, the Employer, etc." This law was approved June 18, 1898. It is but fair to add that the distinction between Employer and Capitalist has been most emphasized in recent years.

[9] The word "fittest" is used in a relative sense; viz., those who best meet the demands of the system, whether or not they are right or wrong. Professor Wagner shows admirably in his Grundlegung der Politischen Oekonomie, 3d ed., pp. 814-820, the danger in this fact.

to bring out best the business view. His general faculties are not harmoniously developed.[10] He is acutely conscious of his power and industrial responsibility; of the value of his services to society and progress. His delight in successful exertion is passionate; his intolerance of failure or opposition, intense. He sees in machines, raw stuff, buildings and laborers one homogenous collection of commodities; the elements of a system of which he is master and manager. His genius is to show itself in transforming raw material into finished product most profitably and successfully. The broad ethical view of human life, of business and business relations, of labor and workman, cannot retain its force and value. The dignity and rights of the laborer vanish the moment that labor is levelled into a commodity, as is now generally the case.[11] There is practically no personal contact between Employer and laborer. Neither understands the other since neither knows the other. When work is done and salary paid all is over between them. A deep humane interest in the laborer is not often found in the employer.[12] Even where it is found the reason is often purely a business principle, "because it pays to treat the help well."[13]

2. The Employer is part of a vast system of industry. He and his interests have a hundred points of contact with the organization of which he is part. He must accept the principles, methods and aims of competitive industry or surrender. He is in no sense free to follow his own ideas, to pursue methods which might please him. He is a competitor and he can succeed only in as far as he meets the demands made upon him. True enough, he may pay

---

[10] Bryce, speaking of the so-called "Capitalist Class" in this country, says: "In no country does one find so many men of eminent capacity for business, shrewd, forcible and daring, who are so uninteresting, so intellectually barren, outside the sphere of their business knowledge." American Commonwealth, 3d ed., vol. ii., p. 301.

[11] Statements from Employers which confirm this may be found in the Senate Report; testimony of Norvin Green, President of the W. U. Telegraph Co., vol. i., pp. 907,956; testimony of Jay Gould, vol. i., p 1090; testimony of Mr. Wickes, of the Pullman Co., in the Report on the Chicago Strike, p. 609, where he says: "We go into the market for men just as we go into the market for anything else."

[12] Levasseur remarked this in his studies in U. S., see L'ouvrier Americain, vol. ii., p. 413: A striking proof that this is the case is found in the volume recently issued by the U. S. Department of ---or on The Economic Aspects of the Liquor Problem. Letters were sent to a large number of manufacturers asking them if they prohibited the use of intoxicants among their operatives; if so, from what motive. In a total of 899 replies from manufacturers (sufficiently complete for purposes of comparison) we find—to cite but a few replies—that 316 forbade the use of liquor from fear of accident, 322 on account of responsibility of position, 22 for the sake of good example simply, 26 for the sake of good example as one motive, while 2 gave as their motive "the good of the employee," and 2 others "to guard against temptation," page 71.

[13] Statements of Employers showing this may be found in the Senate Report, vol. iii., pp. 382, 514; Chicago Strike Report, p. 269.

high wages, he may inaugurate profit sharing and the like. But as far as he does so he, as a rule, weakens himself for the competitive struggle and he belongs no longer to the class of Employers which we are describing. So great is the need of watchfulness, discretion, energy and unified management; so severe the penalty when they are lacking in business; so varied and great, the risks to which the Employer is subjected, that his responsibility is practically endless. Wisely chosen assistants may give him aid, but he is not thereby released. He alone can judge, act, direct. Before his eyes the industrial world appears in miniature, its forces at work, its tendencies developing, and he must largely control or direct them. He must watch his competitors lest they defeat him, protect himself against the progess of centralization lest he be swallowed up by trusts or similar combinations; he must be prepared to add constantly to his capital to meet developments and thus increase his risks in the face of decreasing profits. Inevitably the Employer's sense of self, his habit of self assertion and faith in self are greatly developed. His individuality towers high over the world of which he is master. His sense of independence appears in his attitude to everything that in anyway threatens to encroach on the field where he is master. So marked is this that at times an employer will refuse to join any association of manufacturers.[14] Even when such associations exist, their purpose is largely social or the advancement of the technical interests of the trade. They in no way hamper the individual employer in the competitive struggle, nor do they in any manner make the struggle less keen.[15] The Employer's sense of independence asserts itself not only in his attitude to competitors and the public, but as well in his views of any attempt of the civil authorities to interfere in the management of his business, even when the interests of society are at stake. He claims the absolute right to manage his business to suit himself and he brooks no interference whatsoever.[16] The determined re-

[14] An Employer said to the Senate Committee in 1883: "I do not believe in giving up to any irresponsible man my right of private judgment. That is the reason I belong to no association. I would not join an Employers' association under any conditions." Report, vol. ii., p. 1122.

[15] At the annual banquet of the Philadelphia Piano Trade Association in April, the President said: "I am aware that this is an occasion of armed neutrality—that when we go home, . . . . . when the fierce rays of to-morrow's commercial sun shall have laid bare your little scheme for knocking the other fellow out, hostilities will be resumed." The Musical Age, April 13, 1899.

[16] Mr. Pullman stated to the Strike Commission that he repudiated arbitration since it "violated the principle that a man should have the right to manage his own property." Report, page 556. The Commissioners themselves state in the report that: "We also have employers who obstruct progress by perverting and misapplying the law of supply and demand, and who, while insisting upon individualism for workmen, demand that they shall be let alone to combine as they please and that society and all its forces shall protect them in their resulting contentions." Page xlvii.

sistance which most employers make against trusts is but the natural outcome of this highly developed sense of individuality and unwillingness to surrender the place and the power which they have won in industry. Filled with the sense of his responsibility, marked by a strong individuality, the Employer is easily led to regard himself as a great benefactor of the public, and in particular of the laboring man. He is thus led to give full value—if not an exaggerated appreciation—to his own services, while he is apt to underrate the services of laborers and others to the cause of social progress.[17]

3. With this development of the sense of self, the habit of self assertion and the spirit of independence, a change appears in the motives which animate the Employer. Originally he may have sought money or profit, but a time comes when money as such ceases to be a motive. Through the successful application of his powers of organization the employer comes to love power itself instead of money, and the aim of life then becomes—or is apt to become—its possession and undisputed exercise, victory in competition, control of the market, extension of the sphere of industrial activity, triumph over obstacles. Employers may donate millions to educational institutions or they may dot the land with free libraries under the pretense or with the sincere hope of aiding a good cause, but they will not surrender their power in industry nor attempt to educate their laboring men, if the attempt implies any curtailment of their authority and power.[18] When this stage is reached we occasionally find another peculiar evolution. The Employer who knows his business in a masterly way, but knows little beyond, enters the field of politics where his thirst of power may be satisfied. Fitted in no way whatsoever to study, understand or solve the profound questions of politics, he presumes to enter political life and seeks to acquire all the power possible. His

---

[17] Mr. Edward Atkinson, testifying before the Senate Committee, said of Vanderbilt: "Cornelius Vanderbilt was the greatest and most useful communist of his day, and I mean by that that he may be taken as the exponent of a small class of men who have achieved enormous fortunes in a single life and yet have done more than any other men to bring an ample subsistence within the easy reach of all at a less and less cost, whether cost be measured in labor, in price, in wages or in the purchasing power of labor." Senate Report, vol. iii., p. 343.

[18] Jay Gould stated to the Senate Committee: "Railroads had then got to be a sort of hobby with me—I did not care about the money I made, I took the road as a mere plaything to see what I could do with it. *I had passed the time when I cared about mere money making.* My object in taking the road (if you can appreciate that) was more *to show that I could make a combination and make it a success.*" Senate Report, vol. i, p. 1067.

William Waldorf Astor, writing of his grandfather, expressed a similar thought: "Mr. Astor was not actuated by a mere desire for gain—for he was already rich beyond the needs of any individual—but by a delight in the exercise of those faculties whose calibre had already been so widely proved." Quoted in Freeman's Journal, May 27, 1899.

ambition is not satisfied till he controls a national convention, enters the U. S. Senate or becomes the power "behind the throne." Mere money making as a motive cannot explain one-tenth of the characteristic phenomena of modern industrial life.[19]

4. During this process the ethical conscience of the Employer has undergone radical changes. It has been converted into a business conscience. His faculties have been absorbed into his business activities; his views are those of business; his standard of success and failure, of good and evil has been materially affected. He is in an environment which favors this tendency to an exceptional degree. He is one of a picked class; one of many who have similar faculties, powers, pursuits. The corrective value of close association with others of different psychological constitution is very great, but the Employer is largely withdrawn from its influence. Inevitably some sort of business conscience is formed and its tendency is never upwards.[20] Hence the individual, predisposed to take the business view of life, is practically forced into it, once he fully shares the spirit of his class.[21]

5. Naturally the Employer's opinion of religion, its role in life and its necessity will have been greatly influenced while he is undergoing this series of changes in his views and disposition. It is not easy to find out just what are his views. Laboring men are constantly telling us what they think of religion, the clergy and the pulpit, through the columns of labor journals and in speeches. But Employers have not that custom. It is a striking fact that the Senate Committee of 1883 never asked a single Employer who testified what his views were regarding religion. Many working men, clergymen and others were asked and they gave extended replies, but a careful search failed to discover a single instance of an Employer who expressed an opinion.[22]

This, then, in rough outline, is the Employer. He belongs to

---

[19] Sometimes the passion for making money without any regard for its use becomes very strong. A manufacturer was once asked why he wasted energy and sleep trying to accumulate a fortune which his heirs would squander. He replied: "If they *enjoy spending it* as much as *I enjoy making it* they are welcome."

[20] Professor Wagner shows this admirably in his Grundlegung, vol. ii., p. 820.

[21] It may well to remark that this is not peculiar to the Employer class alone. There is a society conscience, a military conscience, a political conscience, a professional conscience, etc., etc. The tendency in each is to follow the particular instead of the general laws of ethics and to shape principles and views so that the largest liberty is allowed the individual. This implies, of course, a distortion of true conscience. A comparative study of these forms of conscience would be a real contribution to the study of ethics. The reader will remember that reference is made chiefly to tendencies. Some qualifications of these general statements are made in the pages which follow.

[22] It is possible that my search was not exhaustive, as there are over 4000 pages of testimony in the four volumes. No instance appears in the index of any volume, and a careful search in the text enables me to find none.

a peculiar class of men, able and progressive. They have survived a merciless process of selection by which the less skilful and less gifted were crushed.[23] Men of a remarkable sense of individualty, they are energetic, tireless and ambitious. Carrying immense responsibility they come into the exercise of undisputed power and their position gives them great authority.[24] Accustomed to judging life by a sort of business conscience and taking a business view of industry, they are peculiarly sensitive to any consideration based thereon and peculiarly blind to any other. We are now in a fair way to understand the conflict between Employer and Laborer and to appreciate with fair exactness the issues between them.

As to the issues. Workingmen alone who are organized into Trade Unions raise issues with Employers. Though only one-tenth of our wage earners are organized, they are strongly organized and they are representative. Allowing for accidental differences in demands, tone and method we may say that there is uniformity in the issues made by the unions. They have drawn up their declaration of rights and presented it to the Employers. All the battles that have occurred have been for one or another of the rights there claimed. They are substantially the following: The right to dictate to the Employer, the rate of wages, the time and manner of payment, hours and conditions of work, whom he shall hire and whom he shall dismiss, or shall not engage at all; where work shall be done, etc.[25] Furthermore, labor claims the right to enter a factory where all is harmony and contentment and require that laborers engaged there shall make common cause with others who are striking or about to strike; the right to organize into unions is maintained and recognition of unions by Employers is demanded. This in brief is the situation. The Employer believes that he energizes, sustains industry; that his services are immeasurably finer, higher and more efficient than those of laborers, and consequently that he must "manage" the latter. Working men, however, believe that they create all wealth; that they have a right to a greater share in the product of labor than is now received, and they must be made equal to the Employer in the labor contract.[26]

---

[23] It is noticeable that few sons of Employers succeed their fathers in business. They lack talent and energy necessary to become great and successful employers.

[24] See also De Laveleye, Le Socialisme, Introduction, p. xviii.

[25] An examination of the statistics of strikes in the volume of the U. S. Department of Labor on Strikes and Lockouts will give ample illustration of these claims.

[26] Years ago when a New York firm introduced many benevolent features into its business, remonstrances were received from capitalists and others saying: "You are spoiling the working people; you are putting ideas into their heads that will make them hard to manage." Senate Report, vol. ii., p. 1106. The Chicago Strike Commission recommend that employers "consider employees as thoroughly essential to

Between Employer and laborer there are two fundamental points to which the issues may be reduced. The Employer believes that wages are fixed by the mere law of supply and demand; laborers claim that this is radically wrong, since it degrades their labor to the level of commodities and sacrifices their dignity as men; secondly, the Employer insists on his absolute authority in industry, and labor refuses to recognize it. The former is inclined to the business view of life, business and labor, while the view of the latter is ethical. Laborers demand the recognition of their rights as men, endowed with intelligence and social capacity. They insist on the validity of moral law and ethical views in all the relations of life.[27] The Employers view, as we have seen, is largely at variance with this ethical view, and hence the conflict.

In the analysis of the character of the Employer we were forced to look into class characteristics in order to discover the general tendency of those who reach positions of power. In doing so we could not easily qualify every statement or take notice of all facts. It was sufficient for our purpose to show the trend of things. Now, however, when we come to study Employers in their attitudes to the concrete issues which organized labor raises, we must correct those generalizations by examining actual conditions.

Employers aim at large profits and successful industrial enterprise. They are engaged in a keen competitive struggle. When profits fall or danger threatens they must retrench by reducing the cost of raw material, machinery, fuel or labor, or by raising prices. As a rule, every element of production, except labor, is controlled by individuals as powerful and active as our Employer. Labor is weakest and consequently it is most apt to be made feel every danger which threatens the Employer. He can reduce wages ten per cent., but he cannot change the price of wool, iron or coal. In their attitudes toward the general issues raised by labor Employers will vary somewhat.

1. Some will see no justice in any of the demands. They be-

---

industrial success as capital, and thus take labor into consultation at proper times. A speaker at the annual banquet of the Natal Piano Manufacturers' Association in Washington in April, 1899, used the phrase "handling labor in our manufactories." Workingmen do not like such expressions. Musical Age, April 13, 1899, p 10.

[27] Attempts which corporations some times make to evade moral and civil responsibility furnish a good illustration of the attitude of such Employers towards the moral law. Recently a firm was prosecuted by the U. S. for violating the law making 8 hours the legal day in all federal work. The firm argued "that intention is a necessary element of the crime" and "a corporation as such is incapable of entertaining a criminal intention." "A corporation is only an artificial creation, without animate body or mind, and therefore from its very nature incapable of entertaining the specific intention which, by the statute, is made an essential element of the crime defined." U. S. vs. John Kelso Co. Federal Reporter, 86, p. 304.

lieve that in general the condition of labor is satisfactory. They seek and find justification for their view in the millions of laborers who raise no question and make no effort to rise. Such employers will not accord to labor the right to organize and they refuse to deal with organizations or to recognize any question which they propose.[28]

2. Others will recognize the organizations of laborers and deal with them in a limited way, but they may not wish to grant all that is asked or may be unable to do so.

3. Others may be at peace with labor through satisfactory concessions made from whatever motive may best suit, but they may be forced from time to time to withdraw some of the advantages which labor enjoys.[29] Conditions of trade will sometimes make such action necessary, no matter how well disposed the Employer may be.

Whatever the attitude taken by the Employer, at no time is industrial peace insured. The issues between labor and employer cannot be permanently settled in the present order of things. Where nothing is conceded to labor, something will be demanded; effort will not be relaxed till victory be won, let the struggle be ever so unequal and hopeless. Where unions are excluded they will try to enter; where allowed to enter they will attempt to win some power and exercise it. Where something is accorded to labor it will seek more, and where much is conceded, to the satisfaction of labor's demands, there is danger if any retrograde step be attempted by the Employer; danger if non-union men be employed; danger from sympathetic strikes in the interest of other laborers. The eight hour movement is probably the precursor of a demand for six; the attempt to fix and sustain wages through organization is merely the prophet of a new principle of division of profits between Employer and laborer. In the very nature of

---

[28] See, for instance, the testimony of Norvin Green, President of the W. U. Telegraph Co. Senate Report, vol. i, p. 912. Testimony of Mr. Wickes, of the Pullman Co. Report on Chicago Strike, pp. 621, 622. Statistics of strikes showing causes of strikes furnish additional evidence.

[29] The Chicago Strike Commission stated that "the general sentiment of employers shared in by some of the most prominent railroad representatives we have heard, is now favorable to organization among employees." Report p. xlvii. Senator Blair stated during the investigation in 1884 that "many of our corporations are turning their attention to this (humanitarian) side of the question and industry is going to be more and more conducted upon humanitarian principles by the controllers of capital." Senate Report, vol. iii., p. 523. The many disturbances of the past fifteen years cause doubt about the immediate fulfillment of that prophecy. Only last November a number of shoe factories in Marlborough, Mass., posted announcements of the "intention of the manufacturers to conduct their business in the future without reference to or recognition of any labor organization or its agent." Mass. Board of Arbitration, Report 1898, p. 72.

things labor cannot be finally satisfied. And the Employer is well aware of the fact. The problems are subtle and intricate; the prospect of a solution is remote not only because the question is profound, but as well because of the ignorance, passion, partisanship, obstinacy and the demagogues found in abundance where an issue is raised or a question discussed.

It is necessary now to add certain secondary considerations if we would thoroughly understand the attitude of the Employer. Aside from his view of life, his environment and his character—all materially affecting his attitude toward labor—other influences are at work. Some of them are largely individual while others are essentially social.

1. The mistakes of labor engender in the minds of many Employers a feeling of bitterness and resentment. At times laborers are manifestly unreasonable and unjust. Thus, some time since, two employers who had been practical stone cutters were in arrears on a contract and they were unable to find skilled laborers. One of the employers "took off his coat" and went to work with his men. They immediately struck, claiming that the action of the employers "was taking the bread out of the poor man's mouth."[30] A kind and just employer may be converted into a cruel master by such extremes or by business losses brought on by unreasonable or ill advised strikes; by sympathetic strikes among his employees when admittedly they have no grievance in their relations with him; or by the action of labor in taking mean advantage of a situation to press its claims. Aside from particular conflicts, the tone of hatred, execration which so many labor leaders and labor papers affect—and as well, many poorly instructed reformers—creates a feeling of resentment in many employers. They are confounded with the idle and wicked rich, when they are certainly not idle and very often far from wicked, and they are promiscuously condemned for vices which they loathe. Employers have feelings; they are not devoid of all human instincts. This common and ill judged abuse leaves its effect in their disposition, and labor is too often made to feel it.

2. The contrast between the individual employer and individual laborer is noted by the former, and his views are modified by it. The employer has won success by careful habits, regularity, economy, self-denial, by bravely meeting and overcoming obstacles and by unsparing devotion to his work.[31] He does not take vaca-

[30] Senate Report, vol. ii., p. 1123.

[31]. One might wish me to add "and by dishonesty, by oppressing labor, by unscrupulous methods in business." I would have no objection whatever to doing so as far as such is the case, but the insertion bears in no way whatever on the point made.

tions, and he labors day and night and Sunday. He is too busy to be vicious, having the economic virtues to a high degree. He sees among laboring men a lack of self-assertion, initiative and ambition; much intemperance, improvidence and the like; a lack of any desire to conquer obstacles and rise superior to environment. He is then apt to conclude that laborers are to blame for their condition and that they can rise and succeed if they but wish to do so.[32] The effect of the comparison is that much sympathy for laborers is hindered from developing in the mind of the Employer.[33] Mr. Edward Atkinson stated to the Senate Committee in 1884: "If poverty has appeared to increase alongside this accumulation of wealth, it has not been because of the wealth, but for want of such intelligence on the part of those who are poor as would enable them to grasp the benefits which the great masters in the application of capital to useful purposes have brought within their easy reach. If men are poor to-day in this land it is either because they are incapable of doing the work which is waiting to be done or are unwilling to accept the conditions of the work. There are twice as many clerks as are needed and not half enough skilled mechanics; twice as many poor sewing women who can only sew in the poorest way and not half enough skilled seamstresses; twice as many men trying to live by their wits and failing in it as there are capable of applying their heads and hands together to useful arts; twice as much capital waiting to be used as there are men capable of using it profitably to themselves and safely for those of whom they borrow it."[34] There are many who would ascribe most of the strikes and the discontent of labor to intemperance alone.[35].

Whenever the impression becomes fixed in the mind of the employer that the personal faults of laborers are the cause of most of their misfortunes, it is natural to find him firm, unsympathetic

---

[32] "In the last analysis the earnings of the laborer rest wholly upon his individual character, capacity and integrity." Mr. Atkinson's paper before the 3d Convention of Bureau of Labor officials. Report p. 62.

[33] Professor Schmoller notices this as a characteristic of the German Employer, also in his well-known reply to Dr. Treitschke, Uber Einige Grundfragen des Rechts und der Volkswirthschaft, p. 130.

[34] Senate Report, vol. iii., p 344. Last April the Ligget & Meyers Tobacco Co., of St. Louis, was absorbed by the Tobacco Trust. The retiring President, Colonel Wetmore, who manfully refused an office under the trust, addressed the 3000 workmen on the issue. The speech was filled with noble sentiments expressed with great feeling. Speaking of his own rise in business he said: "I mention this to show that it is among the possibilities for any man of fair intelligence, honesty and integrity to climb up." The speech was widely copied in the press. It may be found in the Dubuque Herald, May 14, 1899.

[35] Chicago Strike Report, p. 486, testimony of a physician. Senate Report, vol. iii., p. 217, testimony of an Employer.

and unyielding toward issues raised by labor. The great misfortune is that as between employer and employed each is inclined to see the faults in the other and miss the virtues and personal merits; a condition which Ruskin describes in this manner: "There is a working class strong and happy among both rich and poor; there is an idle class—weak, wicked and miserable—among both rich and poor. And the worst of the misunderstandings arising between the two orders come from the unlucky fact that the wise of one class habitually contemplate the foolish of the other."[36]

3. The two influences just mentioned as affecting the Employer's attitude are of an individual or non-social character. There are some others of a social nature which must also be kept in mind. They are the outgrowth of the fact and conditions of competition. The reader will remember that I have taken general class characteristics rather than a statistical examination of individuals, and that here and there, in the course of this study, I have tried to bring the analysis into relation with facts and to correct it by them. We find all stages of industrial development coexistent; naturally, then, we will find all stages in the mental, moral, psychological and industrial character of Employers coexistent. We will find Employers in whom this many sided development is harmonious and ideal, but we will find others in whom the development is neither harmonious nor ideal. We will find all types of conscience, from the true one to the pure business conscience; all grades of business morality; the good, the bad, the honest, the knavish, etc., etc. Now, all are united in the same competitive struggle; all are in one industrial system. They stand side by side and carry on the industrial war with which we are so familiar. This fact has far reaching consequences for the Employer. The keen, tricky, dishonest competitors exert an enormous influence in dragging the tone of morality down to their level.[37] The Employer who pays his debts must compete with the Employer who fails occasionally and escapes his debts by abusing the most humane of all civil laws; one who wishes to manufacture honest goods must compete with those who falsify, cheat and adulterate;[38] one who desires to treat

---

[36] Crown of Wild Olive, p. 19.

[37] A splendid analysis of the evils of competition, their effect in lowering the tone of business morals the process by which conscience is eliminated or those with conscience are tempted, may be found in Wagner's Grundlegun, 3d ed., vol. ii., p. 794-827.

[38] To mention but one instance: Kansas produces fifty million bushels of high grade wheat from which a fine flour is made. The practice of adulteration is so widespread that the honest millers of the State are appealing to the law for assistance. The entire output of one corn flour mill was used throughout Kansas to adulterate the genuine flour. Kansas Bureau of Labor, Report 1897, p. 171.

laborers humanely must compete with those who rob and oppress helpless men, women and children by sweat shop methods or tyranny, intimidation and the like. A Chicago clergyman, in a recent sermon enumerated seven advantages which are enjoyed by a business man without a conscience; he may deal in sweat shop goods; he may misrepresent in advertising and selling; he can oppress his employes; disregard the Sunday; he can handle merchandise that destroys the moral character of the purchaser; he can break the laws of the State and use those laws to hinder others from competing with him.[39] Honest Employers who may cherish some higher view of life than the mere business view are thus severely handicapped. The force of temptation is certainly very great and they are more or less helpless. The assistance that they may reasonably expect should come from the public and from the State. But it is not effective. All competitors appeal to the public, which they seek to please. But unfortunately the public seems conscious of no obligation and of no opportunity. People buy, guided largely by the principle of cheapness. They do not investigate the conditions of labor, the place where articles are made, the conditions in which they are made, etc. Were the public to unite in one great movement demanding honesty, fairness and sincerity from all Employers, a premium would quickly be placed on honesty and humanity and a punishment meted out to all dishonest and cruel Employers. Then the arm of morality would be strengthened and honest Employers would find it much easier to be honorable while successful than is now the case. An effort has been made to educate the public to a sense of its opportunity and duty in this regard, but with poor success. Labor organizations have devised the so-called Union Label. It is a small label of simple design affixed to all goods manufactured where union labor is employed and union conditions are complied with. While the Trade Union is not perfect—it makes many mistakes—we can take it as an institution which must be encouraged. It represents a healthful ethical reaction in industry. The label is a wise device. But it is generally ignored. The public makes little effort to purchase only union made goods—there is no consciousness of duty. Even laboring men fail at times to remember their principles and then purchase articles which bear no union label. A labor leader of great power once told me of a delegation from some Trade Unions which waited on him to teach him a lesson on employing union labor. It was rumored that he was having some work done by non-union

[39] Chicago Chronicle, May 22, 1899.

men. The report was unfounded, but the leader discovered that the delegates wore hats made by non-union men and they accepted cigars manufactured by non-union cigar makers. This piece of inconsistency is merely a fair illustration of the failure of people in general to assist the honest and humane forces of industry to victory.[40] The Employer does not confine himself to society or the general public in seeking aid by which he may overcome the tendencies of business and the pressure of unfair competition. He looks also to the State and he finds in labor legislation much of the assistance he requires. But here, again, there are grave difficulties. Legislation cannot, at least does not, keep pace with industrial development. The awakening of public conscience is slow; even when it acts, difficulty is encountered, for laws must take account of conditions, and conditions are very dissimilar. The law must take care lest it harm instead of help. Then when laws are enacted they must be enforced. They will be evaded by the dishonest employer and unscrupulous laborer,[41] and the evasion gives advantages to those who wish it. It has been necessary to create an elaborate system of inspection to enforce the observance of labor laws. Only by such means can uniformity be even partially insured, and only when the laws are observed faithfully can the honest Employer expect assistance from them.

If the reader agree with the substance of the analysis here presented, he will be ready to admit that the Employer—such as he is psychologically and industrially—is the typical product of the time —the complex result of a very complex situation. To do him justice we must understand him, and right understanding will not be given to the superficial reformer. To condemn him as a shark and the enemy of man without knowing the process which produces him is neither scientific nor prudent. He is a central figure in modern life, though he is individually far from blameless. Let him who wishes to serve the cause of reform first know and then judge. An effort has been made in this article to suggest to the reader some of the lines along which much serious study must be made if he care for an accurate knowledge of conditions. When exaggeration shall have been set aside and the conditions shall have been honestly and seriously studied, then we may hope for progress in the solution of the labor question.

Rev. W. J. Kerby.

Catholic University, Washington.

[40] An exhaustive article on the Label may be found in the Bulletin of the Department of Labor, March, 1898. A similar movement aiming to improve conditions of retail trade is now taking shape in the formation of Consumers' Leagues.

[41] As an instance, laws forbid that children under 14 enter factories to work. Parents will swear falsely in order to get their children into hte factory at an earlier age.

## WHAT THE POPULAR VICTORY IN IRELAND MEANS.

THAT large class of persons who cling to the philosophy of compromise in mundane affairs are presently exercised over the outcome of the Irish elections. Now, they say, we ought to have done with the eternal Irish question. Home Rule having been shown to be an unattainable goal, the chimera ought to be finally abandoned, and, contented with the substantial alternative gained in Local Government, the people of Ireland should now settle down to make the best they can of the new conditions. The world, they point out, could not get along without the principle of compromise; we must give as well as take; half a loaf is better than no bread, and so on through the whole gamut of wise saws and modern instances. A very large amount of this comfortable counsel is now being administered to the people who have won the victory by acting on the very opposite principle ever since the days of O'Connell. Had they been content with the doctrine of compromise they would have been much better off, in a material sense at least, than they have ever been under English rule. They had but to accept that rule as a matter of destiny; give up the fight for their old religion; hand over the education of their children bodily into the hands of their masters, and become, in short, like the Scotch, an integral portion of the British population, and prosperity had been the story of their island all through, instead of decline, denudation, and poverty. It is but charity to suppose that a large proportion of persons who tender the counsel of contentment and cessation from further political effort are really persuaded of the sufficiency of their knowledge on the question, as they are of their own honesty and good faith in offering the suggestion. If they take the trouble to examine a few of the salient facts which stand out in the present position as between Ireland and the power which Lord Rosebery, by a felicitous slip of the tongue, described as "the dominant partner," they will, perhaps, think differently.

Let us look, first of all, at the attitude of this so-called "partner" regarding the demand for a Catholic University. In vain may we search the pages of history, ancient or modern, for an analogy to the spectacle we now behold. We see the heads of the Government willing at length to grant all that the Irish majority have for generations demanded with pathetic persistency from

hearts as stony and obdurate as those of the Pharaohs. The Unionist majority in England was returned to power on the distinct and oft-repeated pledge of granting to Ireland, while firmly resisting a severance of the Union bond, every reasonable claim and the fullest equality of treatment in matters spiritual and intellectual with the long dominant Protestant minority. The claim for a Catholic University is so irresistible, under the existing conditions, that the leader of the House of Commons pleads with his followers to become "educated" up to the idea. But in vain. In England the powerful body of Nonconformists and in Ireland the despicable and noisy faction called Orangemen threaten the Ministry which would dare to concede the demand whose justice is confessed even by the enlightened agnostic school of writers and politicians, with the direst vengeance. Now the good easy people who pin their faith to compromise as the only reliable unguent for the wheels of mundane life and progress will do well to ponder over the position here exhibited. It is confessed that amongst the first things to which a Parliament in Dublin would put its hand would be the establishment of a Catholic University equal in every respect in teaching staffs and apparatus to the Trinity College foundation. When English Ministries, from motives of political exigency, swallow their own declarations and convictions on such a subject as this, will any man who places their proper relative values on things spiritual and material counsel the people of Ireland to "rest and be thankful?"

Again, the observer who imagines that County Councils are a tolerable substitute for Home Rule may labor under the delusion that the supremacy of the English Parliament is a merely sentimental thing. Any such complacent view of the matter is sadly wide of the mark. To illustrate: A few weeks ago a much needed improvement was sought to be effected in the purlieus of Dublin. In the neighborhood of Guinness's vast brewery there is an ancient nest of rookeries known as Bull Alley, where foul smells formed the recipe for the "embalmed beef" and naturally slain mutton which formed the staple merchandise of rows of forlorn mediaeval butchers' stalls that range the whole way down—places that existed in Dean Swift's time and were smelt by him in his adjacent "Close" in the grounds of St. Patrick's Church. This venerable purlieu the Guinness family desired to have razed and renovated, and for that purpose offered monetary help to the Dublin Corporation. A bill was accordingly presented to Parliament, asking permission of a committee who never probably had been in Dublin or heard of Bull Alley, and after several days' hard battling

was got through. To secure this very insignificant measure of local improvement it was necessary for several members of the Dublin Corporation to proceed to London, to employ English counsel at enormous fees, and go through a course of examination and cross-examination at the hands of people who knew and cared as little about the matter in hand as the King of Dahomey. When it is borne in mind that the minimum cost of getting any, the smallest bill through a Parliamentary Committee, even when there is no opposition to the measure proposed by any party or person, is six thousand dollars, and when there is strong opposition it may cost a hundred times that amount to get a vital public measure—such as the Vartry Waterworks Bill—through the London Committee, it will surely be conceded that there is something more than mere sentiment involved in the agitation against the retention of this legal monopoly in the hands of the London lawyers.

Similarly unsentimental and worldly-practical is the objection of Ireland to the continuance of the system by which the members who represent her at St. Stephen's, in both Houses of Parliament, are compelled to discharge their functions by the banks of the Thames instead of those of the Liffey. These members spend money there which properly belongs to Ireland; they are involuntary absentees for many months in the year. In the good old days, when the Irish Houses of Parliament sat in the Irish capital, the city throve marvellously. Many of the mansions of the nobles and gentry of that halcyon period, now crumbling to decay and sunk in tenemental squalor, have been the astonishment of travellers for the evidences of former splendor they furnish. Vast sums of money were expended on many of these, in magnificent architecture, in sculpture and internal decoration. All this ceased, and the innumerable forms of trade and professional industry which depended on the support of a resident gentry in Dublin followed the course of the Parliament to the shores of Father Thames. In this case the grievance of which Ireland complains is both practical and sentimental. Dublin lost its prestige as well as its money, and the members, to which Dublin stood as head, suffered in relative proportion.

A third illustration: There is no proper comparison between the powers and possibilities of a County Council and a Supreme Parliament. No such Council is competent, under its legal status, to deal with anything beyond its own county concerns. Its functions are strictly defined and limited. A tugboat may more aptly be compared in power and capacity to a great ocean steamer than a County Council to a National Parliament. In the days when

Grattan freed the Irish Parliament from English control in the initiation of Irish measures, for the first time Ireland felt herself in a position to undertake great national enterprises. Parliament voted a million and a half of money for the construction of a great system of canals, and spread the cost all over the country. This was before the era of the steam engine. It was progress, in the sense of the highest spirit of the time. Under the system of County Councils such a work would have been simply out of the question. Every county outside the radius of prospective benefit from the measure would have stood stubbornly in resistance to any such proposal, if mooted at a meeting representative of all. This is human nature—not Irish human nature merely, but nature all the world over. It would be easy to adduce many other examples of the discrepancy between subordinate and law-making assemblies, but this one will suffice to show how wide is the difference between the measure which Ireland has just secured from the reluctant English Unionists and that which they hope yet to attain through rejecting the counsels of compromise and content and keeping right along the lines where they found the principles of unappeasable dissatisfaction most efficacious.

Perhaps the most striking anomaly of all in the relations of Great Britain and Ireland is the grievance exposed by the late Financial Relations Commission. It is, however, unlike other anomalies, a matter unconnected with spiritual and fundamental differences: it is entirely material. About seventeen million dollars annually, over and above her legitimate proportional contribution to the imperial levy, is extracted from Ireland by the peculiar and ingenious methods of taxation devised by successive English Chancellors of the Exchequer. The late Mr. Gladstone was the greatest sinner in this respect. The staggering facts were fully disclosed before the Royal Commission. But the Government of Lord Salisbury will not recognize them, and stubbornly refuses all redress. As long as this enormous wrong is suffered to continue the people of Ireland must feel it the more incumbent on them to press in season and out of season for a release from the parchment bond which links them to so dishonest and conscienceless a partner.

Hardly less powerful as a motive for persistency in the national demand is the economic position of Ireland as affected by England's free trade policy. Ireland is at present, broadly speaking, altogether an agricultural country. Long ago she had a fair share of manufactures to furnish employment to the urban and cottier population, but, owing to the sinister policy of England these in-

dustries were swept away, either by direct legislation, indirect underselling, skillfully contrived strikes, paid for by English capitalists, or other equally effective methods. As long as the English markets were not open to all the world the Irish farming population at least were able to secure some return for their labor, but with the passage of Peel's Corn Laws all this was changed. Now the agriculturist is competing with the products of America in meat and cereals, with Norway and Denmark in butter—and competing at an enormous disadvantage. American products are raised on land which pays no rent, while Irish land pays the highest penny that can be squeezed out of the struggling cultivators; and American imports are produced under all the advantages that the most modern scientific skill can confer. The same is true with regard to the butter from Denmark, Holland and France, which has been gradually forcing the once great trade of Ireland in this article from the markets of Europe. If Ireland is to be preserved from final ruin there must be such a revolution as will place her in a position to frame her own economic policy.

Irish landlords have long been observing these auguries, but with strange fatuity they have never, save in one or two solitary instances, taken sides with the mass of the people who have been struggling against the downward current. Why, then, should any sensible person be surprised at the turn events took when the people got their innings? One would really imagine, from the scream of rage and disappointment which arose from the Unionist press, when the results of the elections under the new Act were fully realized, that something extraordinary and ungrateful had been done to the landlord class.

Whatever the demerits of the landed aristocracy in the past, sound policy would dictate a fair recognition of their order in the new public arrangement. Political vengeance is a policy for tyrants; democracies ought not to ape the vices against which they are a living protest. Generous and forgiving naturally, as the Irish masses are, they would have readily yielded to the plea for consideration for their hereditary oppressors in this crucial hour had the landlords themselves repented of their want of patriotism and thrown in their lot with those who had in sunshine or storm kept up the battle. But they held aloof, as a rule. Only a few accepted the test proposed for all Nationalist condidates, and the unwise ones of the Unionist party began prematurely to predict the triumph of Unionism as a result of the election. The landlords, it was predicted, would, by their influence and the power of concerted action, "knock the bottom out of Home

Rule." The people were put on their mettle. Here was a gage of battle flung down by those who deserved no clemency. For centuries they had lorded it over the people more mercilessly than ever the French peasantry were domineered over by their feudal masters. They had driven them out of the land and over the ocean by the million, torn down their roof-trees, extinguished their hearth-fires. And now they had the temerity to dare them in their day of power. What stupendous folly! Little wonder that the lion bearded shook his mane and at one bound cleared the field of those who thought to enmesh him. Little do those who look only at gross results and salient facts, in such great happenings, know of the currents which run below the surface. It is not alone that the high principle of national autonomy is one of the stakes in the game, but the moral issues involved touch the conscience of the people, in many cases, in its tenderest part. Here are a couple of typical cases for example. They might be multiplied many times over, but they will serve to illumine the general position. The South Dublin Union, and a neighboring one, that of Rathdown, for the adjoining county of Wicklow, have from time immemorial been the stronghold of the most bigoted anti-Catholicism. Every elected guardian was of the genuine Tory and true-blue pattern; all the ex-officios were of the same brand; because the portion of the country where the guardians reside is the most beautiful in the island as well as the most convenient to the metropolis, and as they are the wealthiest people they are able to purchase and rent what is most desirable from an æsthetic as well as commodious point of view. As a result of their old-time preponderance or monopoly at the respective boards not a single office in the workhouses above the rank of watchman was ever known to be held by a Catholic. But this was not the worst feature of the exclusive system. Whenever a deserted child is turned over to the care of the workhouse, unless there is proof positive that it has been baptized in some form of faith, the guardians undertake to decide its religion. That decision, in the case of the South Dublin Union especially, was invariably rendered in the Protestant interest. Again and again have the Bishops and clergy protested against the unblushing bigotry of those guardians, in cases where all the available evidence pointed to the poor waifs having been claimed for the Catholic Church, but of course they pleaded to deaf ears. The people would be more than magnanimous if they allowed such gangs of bigots to continue their nefarious game a moment longer than they had the legal right to do so.

Similarly at the poor-law boards and in the grand-jury rooms

this system of exclusion was vigorously applied in the business functions pertaining to membership. Favorites were invariably selected for the execution of public contracts; partisans and protégés were invariably voted for when offices were to be filled. Ex-officio guardians who on all other occasions were absent from the board-rooms always came flocking in when a pet was the candidate or bidding for a contract. Anyone who imagines that the public service in the United States is the foremost for the perfecting of systematized corruption must be ignorant of the methods of the old Irish grand-jury room and those of the poor-law boards. The system there was of such hoary antiquity and smoothness of operation as to lead people to believe it was at once indestructible and incurable.

One factor in the determination of the problem had an especially important bearing on the event, and yet it seems to have entirely escaped the attention of those philosophic observers who have made a study of the episode for purposes of scientific analysis. It was forgotten that the Government, in drafting the measure had ostentatiously insulted the religious spirit of Ireland by excluding from the ranks of the eligible the Irish bishops and clergy. While women were admitted to the lists as contestants for Council honors, those who have been looked up to as the trusted counsellors of the people were branded as unfit to take part in public affairs by members of a Protestant Government. This insult was keenly felt, and when, in addition to its rankle, there came the intimation that this measure of Local Government was intended as a weapon to give the death-blow to the Home Rule agitation, it would have been miraculous if the blood of the country did not flame up in spontaneous revolt. It was felt at once that a crisis had arisen, and any indecision or ambiguity about the answer must be productive of serious mischief by furnishing the enemy with an irrefutable argument. The Irish people, it would be pointed out, were indifferent both with regard to their religion and their distinct nationality. Their religious leaders had lost control as well as their political chiefs; and this fact would be triumphantly referred to as a symptom of progress and a stride in assimilation with Great Britain. Of the supremest value, then, is the message sent back from the Irish ballot-boxes to the Machiavellian contrivers of this double-action political engine. As regards both religion and national aspirations Ireland stands firm as a rock. She is still the Ireland of the olden time, strong in faith, strong in her assertion of her inalienable right. She is in these two vital things unchanged and unchangeable. When we find a prelate of

the exalted position of Cardinal Logue proclaiming his conviction that without Home Rule it was impossible for Irish Catholics to obtain justice, who will venture to assert that Ireland was intolerant in rendering the answer she did when opportunity for speaking her mind was presented to her? In returning twenty-six out of thirty-three County Chairmen pledged to that principle, she has put herself on record in a manner that no one can misunderstand. She has, incidentally, given the quietus to Mr. John Redmond and other gentlemen of adroit finesse who advised the people to a contrary course. It was no time for parleying with the common enemy.

Overwhelming as was the popular victory it was not wanting in examples of generosity. In several instances members of the aristocratic order, though not of the religion of the masses, secured seats in wholly Catholic constituencies; while, on the contrary, Ulster bigotry proved itself true to its old tradition by voting down every candidate who did not bear the Tory and Orange hall-mark. Hence the Unionists, when they taunt their opponents with exclusiveness, forget their own principles. There is one course open to the Irish landocrats. They will be welcomed to the National ranks if they honestly and avowedly repent of an evil past, and come forward manfully to aid in the regeneration of their country. It is not yet too late, but they should remember the story of the Sibylline books and ponder on its lesson.

John J. O'Shea.

## VITTORIA COLONNA.

MANY writers have claimed that a romantic affection existed between Michael Angelo and Vittoria Colonna. Longfellow, among others, seems to have shared this opinion; he was an ardent admirer of Vittoria's pure and noble character and has given us a sympathetic study of her in his drama, Michael Angelo. Doubtless at first the idea pleases our fancy, but later and keener critics have shown the untruthfulness of this view of the relations between the great artist and the high-born lady. John Addington Symonds, in his biography of the master based upon the archives of the Buonarotti family at Florence, is especially emphatic upon this point. He says that Michael Angelo the younger gave a false idea of his uncle by revising and redating the sonnets; that many currently believed to have been dedicated to the marchioness are just as likely to have been written for friends of his own sex. Symonds says that there was no "love" in his friendship for Vittoria Colonna, and that while Michael Angelo was noted for "the strength of his domestic affections he never thought of marrying." Moreover, Buonarotti's "great age rendered this (touch of passion) improbable; while the general tenor of their correspondence is that of admiration for a great artist on the lady's side and of attraction to a noble nature on the man's side, cemented by religious sentiment and common interest in serious subjects." Mrs. Oliphant, in a charming sketch in her Makers of Florence, says: "no woman ever came into his life but Vittoria Colonna," yet he felt for her not love, but "tender and reverential warmth of friendship." And so we would like to believe as we learn more of these two great souls. The solitary genius wedded to his art, broken-hearted at the desolation of his beautiful Florence, putting the passionate stormy unrest of his soul into those wonderful marbles that shall live for all time, finds calm and peace in the society of this noble lady. She consoled him in his disappointments and upheld him when those on whom he had relied failed him. She filled every want of his nature; with a mind capable of soaring to the heights his imagination reached she was tender and soothing while conflict had made him distrustful and satirical. She brought a softening influence to bear that no one else had ever been able to exert, and above all she encouraged that spirit of religion that had always characterized him, so that as time went on his piety became deeper and more devout. Their mutual confidences are very touching and ennobling. In one letter to him, she writes: "May God grant that

when I come to Rome again, I may find you with the image of Our Saviour living and renewed in your heart as you have so beautifully painted it in the scene with the Samaritan woman." Our interest is naturally aroused in a woman capable of attracting such a man, and each glimpse we get of her as she appears from time to time in the great master's life deepens our reverence for the woman he called friend. Gifted with a rare intellect enriched by study and intercourse with the noblest minds of her time, Vittoria Colonna bestowed honor where she gave friendship. Her family had contributed to the glory of Italy in war and peace since the eleventh century. The Colonna claim to possess the very column to which our Saviour was bound during His scourging, hence according to legend the origin of their name. Vittoria's father, Fabrizio, Lord High Constable of Naples, served with distinction in the armies of France and Arragon, and was taken prisoner at the battle of Ravenna. Vittoria's childhood was passed in Naples, where she was born in 1490. Surrounded by every luxury of that rich and lavish period, her young life opened with every promise of a brilliant and happy future, but like her own beloved city, it was all too soon to be rudely shaken, and its brightness overshadowed by clouds. At the age of four she was betrothed to Ferdinand d'Avalos, son of the Marquis of Pescara, a boy no older than herself. The marriage took place when they attained their seventeenth year. They stand before us as types of that wonderful age whose vigor had not yet become paganized and debased. Talented and accomplished, and, fortunately, devoted to each other, they found delight in the study of poetry and kindred arts. An ideal life seemed to stretch before them, when the pang of war awoke them from their dream and summoned the young husband to sterner duties. Called by Charles V. to defend his country at the outbreak of hostilities between France and Venice, Ferdinand Pescara became one of the emperor's most trusted Italian officers. On his departure for the seat of war Vittoria presented her beloved husband with a tent and standard embroidered by her own hands, and kept up a constant and affectionate correspondence with the youthful commander during his long and enforced absence. Quitting her quiet home at Ischia, she returned to Naples, thinking to be near him and to see him occasionally, but the duties of his responsible position prevented their meeting. Vittoria passed her lonely hours in the study of ancient and modern authors and in writing graceful verses which flowed naturally from a mind filled with high and loving thoughts. At the battle of Ravenna the marquis was taken prisoner, and carried with Cardinal Medici, afterwards Leo X, to Milan. During his confinement there he wrote a dialogue on Love,

addressed to his wife. Roscoe characterizes it as replete with "good sense, eloquence and wit." After his liberation he led many successful engagements under the banner of the emperor, acquiring a high reputation for magnanimity as well as courage. His treatment of noble opponents, as in the case of Chevalier Bayard, was marked by courtly generosity.

After the victory at Pavia, February, 1525, which was attributed largely to the heroic efforts of Pescara, the Italian princes offered him the kingdom of Naples, hoping to strengthen their cause by the acquisition of so brilliant an ally. Vittoria, to whom this plot was communicated, implored her husband not to sully his honor by so base an act of treachery. She wrote him: "It is by virtue alone, and not by grandeur of position or title that we acquire that honor which is so glorious an inheritance to leave to one's descendants. As for myself, I have no desire to be the wife of a king, but rather of that great captain who has conquered the most powerful of kings, not only by his valor in war, but by his magnanimity in peace." According to some authorities, Pescara, dazzled by the splendor of the bribe, gave no heed to this noble remonstrance, but yielded, and was really guilty of double treachery, first joining the conspirators against the emperor, and then betraying them to the monarch. But the concensus of opinion among our ablest critics to-day clears him from this charge, and we have every reason to believe that his native integrity of soul responded to the appeals of his wife, and that he refused all alliance with the traitors.

The marquis had been wounded at the battle of Pavia, and imprudence in exposure to the sun, and in drinking ice-water, brought on a fever from which he suffered all through the long, hot summer. Finally as he did not appear to rally and his weakness became extreme, a messenger was despatched in haste to inform the marchioness of her husband's dangerous condition. The young page sent on this sad errand found the faithful wife praying in her private chapel. His unceremonious entrance prepared her for the evil nature of his tidings; with a look, the marchioness demanded an explanation. On being informed of her husband's precarious condition, she summoned her household and hurriedly set out for Milan; but near Viterbo was met by a second messenger whose silent grief told her all. Dismounting and kneeling down in the dust of the road, the bereaved wife gave vent to her sorrow in tears and prayers, then with a sad dignity retraced her steps to that home forever desolate. For a time it seemed as though the blow was greater than nature could bear, and for months that brilliant intellect was clouded. Expressions of sympathy came from nearly every sovereign and man of note in Europe; the admiration they

evinced for her husband's noble qualities was as balm to her wounded and lonely heart. Religion, too, finally exercised its soothing influence, and after a long period of prostration, Vittoria resumed her wonted interest in the life about her. She realized that after all, death is but a temporary separation and that she would soon be reunited in happiness and glory with her lost love. This thought dominating her mind she gave herself up to prayer, meditation and the writing of verses in honor of her husband. She gave no heed while celebrating his virtues and talents, to the numerous suitors who sought her hand, some of them princes of renown. Having given her whole heart in its freshness to the beloved companion of her youth, she could not believe it possible to ever share it with another. A singular loneliness of soul seems to have been Vittoria's portion even in early life, despite the perfect love existing between her husband and herself. Public affairs claimed most of his time, and after his death the habit of committing her thoughts and feelings to paper rather than to friends, however dear, was intensified. The better to indulge her love for solitude and thought, she retired to St. Sylvester, a convent attached to the Colonna palace in Rome, where she lived the beautiful life of one indeed a widow, such as St. Paul describes. During this time she wrote many exquisite sonnets that entitle her to rank among the first poets of Italy. Nor did she neglect the poor and sorrowing. Her grief was no morbid self-indulgence; on the contrary it quickened her tender sympathy, and to every call she responded generously, bestowing, as need was, of her wealth or her magnetic power of lifting up the hearts around her to Christ the Consoler. Her dignity of demeanor and her absolute freedom from all that was petty or unworthy secured the regard and respect of the highest, and made her the crowning ornament of every society in which she moved. Count Pietro Ercole Visconti of Rome, considered to be the most trustworthy of her biographers, says: "But if Vittoria was faithful to the ashes of her beloved husband, refusing to contract any of the new alliances which were offered to her from all parts of the world, she had no desire to avoid friendships, especially with the learned. She liked to converse at length with those men, who on account of nobility of soul, valor in arms, the study of art, science or literature, and above all, acknowledged virtue were admired in her own time. Giovi dedicated to her through friendship, the seven books of the life and exploits of her husband, the Marquis Francis d'Avalos: the poet Ludovico Domenichi obtained her favor by offering her consoling elegies, and the illustrious Dolce, Molza, Guidiccioni, Bembo, Pole, Castiglione, l'Alamani, Bernardo Tasso, Ariosto andMichael Angelo received her friendship in exchange for splendid works of prose and poetry."

In 1534 began her acquaintance with Michael Angelo, who seems to have at once recognized in her a kindred soul, and the acquaintance soon ripened into the tenderest friendship. The countess' keen appreciation of art and poetry formed a strong tie between them. He drew her portrait, which was afterwards painted by Marcello Vepusti. A few of the letters he wrote her remain. Many of his sonnets were addressed to her. Only four of Vittoria's letters to Michael Angelo have come down to us, though it is known that he kept those she wrote from Orvieto and Viterbo, and had them bound with some of her sonnets. On one occasion the marchioness had sent him a vellum book containing a number of her sonnets. In 1542, writing from Viterbo, she enclosed forty others written during her residence there. This letter begins:

[1]"Magnificent Master, Michael Angelo: I have not answered your letter before, thinking that if you and I continue to write according to my obligation and your courtesy, it will be necessary for me to leave St. Catherine's Chapel, without finding myself with the Sisters at the appointed hours, and that you must abandon the Pauline Chapel, and not keep yourself all the day long in sweet colloquy with your paintings, . . . . so, that I from the brides of Christ and you from His Vicar, shall fall away."

In a letter written between 1539 and 1540, preserved in the Buonarotti Museum in Florence, the marchioness writes about a Taking down from the Cross, painted for her by Michael Angelo:

"Your works forcibly awaken the judgment of those who examine them, and to give you a proof of it, I have dared to speak to you of adding beauty to what is already perfect. I have now seen that 'omnia possibilia sunt vredenti.' I have had great faith that God would give you a supernatural grace to paint this Christ. Since seeing it I have found that it surpassed all my expectations, and emboldened by your prodigies, I have desired what I see now so marvellously accomplished, that is that each part should attain such a perfection that nothing more could be wished for, and that nothing so perfect could be dreamed of. I rejoice greatly that the Angel on the right is so beautiful, because it sems to me that it is in some way a promise that St. Michael will on the last day place you, Michael Angelo, on the right hand of Our Lord.

Meanwhile, I know not what I can do for you in return, save to pray for you to this same sweet Christ whom you have so beautifully painted, and to beg that you will call upon me when I can in any way serve you."

The Marchioness of Pescara.

Michael Angelo's first letter to the marchioness, dated Rome,

[1] English version from Artist Biographies, published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

1545, is as follows: "I desired, lady, before I accepted the things which your ladyship has often expressed the will to give me—I desired to produce something for you with my own hand, in order to be as little as possible unworthy of this kindness. I have now come to recognize that the grace of God is not to be bought, and that to keep it waiting is a grievous sin. Therefore I acknowledge my error, and willingly accept your favors. When I possess them, not indeed because I shall have them in my house, but for that I myself shall dwell in them, the place will seem to encircle me with Paradise. For which felicity I shall remain ever more obliged to your ladyship than I am already if that were possible." The following sonnet is enclosed in this letter:

Seeking at least to be not all unfit
For thy sublime and boundless courtesy,
My lonely thoughts at first were fain to try
What they could yield for grace so infinite.
But now I know my unassisted wit
Is all too weak to make me soar so high,
For pardon, lady, for this fault I cry,
And wiser still I grow remembering it.
Yea, well I see what folly 'twere to think
That largess dropped from thee like dews from heaven
Could e'er be paid by work so frail as mine.
To nothingness my art and talent sink;
He fails who from his mortal stores hath given
A thousandfold to match one gift divine.

Shortly after the artist sent the following letter in relation to a Crucifixion designed by him for Vittoria:[2]

"Lady Marchioness:—Being myself in Rome, I thought it hardly fitting to give the crucified Christ to Messer. Tommaso, and to make him an intermediary between your ladyship and me, your servant; especially because it has been my earnest wish to perform more for you than for anyone I ever knew upon the world. But absorbing occupations, which still engage me, have prevented my informing your ladyship of this. Moreover, knowing that you know that love needs no task-master, and that he who loves doth not sleep, I thought the less of using go-betweens. And though I seemed to have forgotten, I was doing what I did not talk about in order to effect a thing that was not looked for. My purpose has been spoiled: He sins who faith like this so soon forgets.' "

The sonnet given below seems to have been sent at the same time.

Blest spirit, who with loving tenderness
Quickenest my heart, so old and near to die,
Who 'mid thy joys on me dost bend an eye
Though many nobler men around thee press.
As thou wert erewhile wont my sight to bless,
So to console my mind thou now dost fly;

[2] Translated by John Addington Symonds.

Hope, therefore, stills the pangs of memory,
Which, coupled with desire, my soul distress.
So finding in thee grace to plead for me—
Thy thoughts for me sunk in so sad a case—
He who now writes returns thee thanks for these.
Lo! it were foul and monstrous usury
To send thee ugliest paintings in the place
Of thy fair spirit's living phantasies.

A letter from the marchioness not dated but apparently written in answer to the above is found in the British Museum:

"Unique Master, Michael Angelo, and my most particular friend: —I have received your letter and seen the Crucifix which is crucified in my memory more than any other painting I have ever looked upon. Certainly one cannot see any better made, nor find anywhere a more living and finely executed image of Our Saviour, and truly I marvel at such perfection. Therefore I am resolved to have it from no hand but yours: if this is not your handiwork, then, patience for a little while. If it is yours I must have it at any cost, but if it is the work of another or you wish to have it copied by one of your pupils I want to have a talk with you about it first, for knowing the difficulty there would be in copying it, I would infinitely rather have him complete some other work for you. But if this crucifix is really yours, pardon my boldness, but I will never return it to you. I have examined it by daylight, by lamplight, and in a looking glass, and I have never seen anything more perfect.

"Yours to command,
"The Marchioness of Pescara."

The great lady's interest in the crucifix is still further shown in the few lines following, sent not long afterwards to Michael Angelo:

"I beg you to let me have the crucifix a short while in my keeping even though it be unfinished. I want to show it to some gentlemen who have come from the Most Reverend, the Cardinal of Mantua. If you are not working will you not come to-day at your leisure and talk with me?"

"Yours to command,
"The Marchioness of Pescara."

It will be noticed that the marchioness usually writes quite "a la grande dame," though the note copied above shows that she sometimes adopted a more familiar style in her correspondence.

The Sixteenth Century, rich though it was in poets, both men and women, has produced nothing to equal the religious poems of Vittoria Colonna. She was the most successful of all who adopted the style of Petrarch. Roscoe says, "her sonnets possessed more

vigor of thought, vivacity of coloring and natural pathos, than those of any of her contemporaries. Ariosto alone excelled her in the "ottava rime." In 1845 her bust was placed in the capitol at Rome. It represents a noble and beautiful face slightly tinged with melancholy.

Among the many distinguished persons whose friendship brightened Vittoria's long widowhood, may be mentioned Veronica Gambara, Countess of Correggio. Of these two noble women, Roscoe says they were "conspicuously eminent for high rank, extraordinary acquirements, excellent literary productions and unsullied purity of character and all virtues that add lustre to their sex." Surely this is high praise and from one who cannot be accused of partiality. The countess established a sort of academy in her home, where Cardinal Bembo and other learned men gathered; Charles the V also visited there. The example set by Veronica Gambara and Vittoria Colonna was quickly emulated by other ladies of high rank who produced poems of no small merit. The works of these literary women met with success in their own day and rank as classics in Italian literature.[3]

Francis of Holland, a Portuguese miniature painter, gives us in his "Dialogues on Painting," a charming account of an evening spent in 1538 at San Silvestro, where Vittoria passed many of the most peaceful years of her life. He recounts with great interest conversations between the master and the noble company assembled at the home of the marchioness and pays her a tribute valuable for its quaintness and evident sincerity. "The Lady Vittoria Colonna, sister of Messer. Ascagno Colonna, is one of the most distinguished and celebrated women to be found in Europe, that is to say in the world. As beautiful as she is noble in her manners, skilled in the Latin tongue and full of talent, she has every quality and virtue that ornament a woman. Ever since the death of her heroic husband she has led a quiet life retired from the world. Sated with the splendors and grandeurs of her former lofty position, she now loves only Jesus Christ and the study of

[3] Four editions of Vittoria's poems were printed during her lifetime, the first by Filippo Pirogallo, without her knowledge, at Parma in 1583, under the title of Rhymes of the Divine Vittoria Colonna de Pescara. Afterwards twenty-four sonnets on sacred subjects and a hymn on the triumph of the Cross were added. Editions were subsequently published at Naples and at Florence. A pamphlet on the Passion of Our Divine Redeemer was published at Bologna and the edition was renewed at Venice. In 1840 a new edition of her poems and a life by Visconti appeared.

[4] Costanza d' Avalos, Duchess of Amalfi, wrote admirable sonnets, some of which were published with those of Vittoria Colonna, at Sessa, in 1538. But the most noted of these literary women, after the Marchioness of Pescara, was Tarquinia Molza, celebrated for her genius, for her education and for the purity of her moral character in a corrupt age. She translated the works of Plato into Italian. The Senate bestowed upon her the title of Roman citizen in recognition of her merit.

serious things, doing meanwhile much good to poor women and being for them a model of true Catholic piety." That Vittoria was not merely a silent though courteous listener during these reunions is shown by the respect paid to her judgment by the men who formed part of her literary circle. Balthazar Castiglione felt honored by her friendship and sent his Cortigiano to be read by her before publishing it.

We have another pen picture of Vittoria in a letter of Count Fortune Martinengo of Brescia, dated June 7, 1546. Writing of the marchioness, whom he met frequently while in Rome, he says: "She is certainly a woman of unusual gifts and according to what I hear she is all on fire with the love of Our Lord. She speaks of him so often not only with the lips but from the heart. And what humility! what unparalleled goodness! and with the manners of a princess which she is by nature as well as by title! While these qualities attract all hearts they guide her in the path where she advances so rapidly and so gloriously. I have visited her several times and but for fear of intruding I should never have taken my leave. Her reasoning is so convincing that it seems as though her words forge chains that lead captive the intelligence of all who listen to her. Since I was not permitted to refresh longer my soul with her beautiful and saintly conversation, I at least console myself with thinking that it is a great advantage to have known her and to have become the devoted servant of the greatest and noblest woman under the sun. For this privilege I am as grateful to your lordship as I am to the marchioness for her goodness and courtesy."

It has been charged by some that the Marchioness of Pescara affected the doctrines of the Reformation. On this subject Symonds says that "her chief friends belonged to that group of earnest thinkers who felt the influences of the Reformation without ceasing to be loyal children of the Church." To bring the Church back to purer morals and sincerity of faith was their aim. They yearned for a reformation and regeneration from within.[4] "That Vittoria never adopted Protestantism, though her intimacy with men of liberal opinions exposed her to mistrust and censure in old age, and that she was placed "under the supervision of the Holy Office." Roscoe, in his life of Leo X, says, "there was some suspicion that she (Vittoria) was attached to the doctrines of the

[5] And this very regeneration was going on quietly but surely. Augusta Theodosia Drane, in her admirable Christian Schools and Scholars, says, "the leaven of reform was working all this time." The fifth Lateran Council, held under that staunch reformer, Adrian, issued decrees for the study of the scriptures," the reform of universities and the consecration of Sunday, and, "again, when her enemies thought her dead, the Church arose to a more vigorous and beautiful life."

Reformed Church," and that these suspicions depended principally "upon conjectures arising from her friendly connections and correspondence with Flaminius, who openly showed himself favorable to the cause of reform." But Flaminius, as we know, died a Catholic, and this especial friendship instead of leading Vittoria away from the Church seems to have brought the wanderer back to it. Her life-long friendship with members of various religious houses where she continued to dwell and with the zealous clergy who fought for the integrity of the faith would certainly set at rest any doubts as to the nature of her influence over those who wavered or openly rebelled. But her own letters written at this period are evidence of her unswerving loyalty to the Church. When Fra Bernardino, whom she greatly admired, left the Church, she writes to Pope Marcellus, "He is out of the Ark that saves and protects."

Another letter written some time between 1542 and 1547 to Pope Paul III breathes the true spirit of a child of the Holy See. "The sacred will of your Holiness in regard to the alms intended for the sisters at Viterbo has not yet been fulfilled, although it has been graciously expressed on two occasions. And because I am sure that these alms could not be better bestowed, I have ventured to ask them of your Holiness, believing that your charity will be increased by the gift for which I hope and for which these good sisters are already grateful. Among the numberless charities of your Holiness, more generous perhaps, than any other Pope, this one would be, I think, most pleasing to God; it would besides be granting a very great favor to me your most devoted servant. However, I neither wish nor desire anything but to serve your holiness whom I pray God to bless with every consolation.

"Your humble servant, daughter and subject,

"The Marchioness of Pescara."

It is probable that during this time Vittoria followed the advice of Cardinal Pole, for many years her director, whose acquaintance she made while living at the convent of St. Catherine in Viterbo. The Cardinal was at that time Papal Legate to England, and had been appointed by the Pope Governor of Viterbo. Many persons of distinction followed him hither; he won all hearts by his gentleness and tact, bringing back to the true fold, among others, Flaminius, who had been led away by the errors of the times. In his unremitting labors for the material and spiritual welfare of his diocese, the Cardinal, was aided by the ready sympathy and support of Vittoria. She was one of the most honored members of the Viterbo Society, which Cardinal Pole founded and which counted among its members some of the greatest minds of the

age. Her co-operation in his work among the poor cemented their holy friendship, while his advice was invaluable to her in the troubled times when wordy disputes about doctrine were general in all classes and confused many upright minds. The Cardinal counselled patience and a suspension of judgment until the Holy See had spoken. Thanks to this wise advice faithfully followed, Vittoria's faith and peace of mind remained unshaken when so many she had known and loved fell away. Her friendship for the Cardinal terminated only at her death. She bequeathed him the sum of ten thousand crowns, but the self-denying prelate declined the legacy and transferred the whole of it to the relatives of the marchioness. Her own austerity of life was so severe that her holy director felt constrained to urge moderation lest she should ruin her health already frail.

In 1544 Vittoria returned from Viterbo to Rome; none of her family were there at the time; her brother was still in disgrace with the Holy See and the palace of the Colonnas was closed. She took up her residence at the convent of St. Catharine de Funari, finding this secluded home thoroughly in keeping with her feelings and her usual mode of living. Her long and beautiful life was drawing to a close. After twenty-two years of true widowhood, devoted to the memory of her husband, to her friends, to literature, to God, she was about to pass to her true home, to meet the God whom she had so unswervingly followed. The reunion with the long-lost love of her youth for which she had so yearned was about to be realized. Her health had been for some years a cause of grave anxiety to her friends. In January, 1547, becoming much weaker and feeling the need of greater care than could be bestowed in her simple surroundings, she allowed herself to be removed to the Cesarini palace near the Torre Argentina, owned by her cousin Giulia Colonna Cesarini. Here she died on the 25th of February, 1547, at the age of fifty-seven. She was buried, in compliance with her expressed wish, in the simple vaults used by the religious of St. Catherine's and without any of the display customary to her rank.

Vittoria's friends grieved beyond measure at the loss of their dear and treasured counsellor. They missed her gracious presence, her sympathetic affection, her sound judgment, her strong self-reliance. To her venerable friend, Michael Angelo, now in his seventy-second year, the loss was irreparable. Always a solitary soul, he was now too old to form new ties, even had he wished it. And besides where could he turn? Having loved the noblest and greatest of women, could he stoop to any inferior? This great blow left him dazed and desolate; he mourned her unceasingly. Con-

divi says: "And Michael Angelo's soul was inflamed with so great a love for Vittoria that I remember to have heard him say with tears that nothing in the world filled him with such bitterness as to have seen Vittoria dead and to have kissed merely her hand instead of her pure lips." In his loneliness after her death he was frequently heard to exclaim, "Ah, cruel death! you have stolen away my best and dearest friend, the guiding star of my genius." Longfellow represents him as uttering this pathetic soliloquy:

> Well, what matters it,
> Since now that greater light, that was my sun,
> Is set, and all is darkness, all is darkness?
>
> "I have no friends and want none. My own thoughts
> Are now my sole companions,—thoughts of her,
> That like a benediction from the skies
> Come to me in my solitude and soothe me."
>
> "Grateful to me is sleep. More grateful now
> Than it was then; for all my friends are dead;
> And she is dead, the noblest of them all.
> I saw her face when the great sculptor, Death,
> Whom men should call divine, had at a blow
> Stricken her into marble; and I kissed
> Her cold, white hand. What was it held me back
> From kissing her fair forehead, and those lips,
> Those dead, dumb lips? Grateful to me is sleep!"

Posterity continues to repeat the praises bestowed by her contemporaries on the saintly and beautiful character of Vittoria. Every noble nature that contemplates her life and works responds with a thrill of admiration. We cannot close this inadequate sketch better than by quoting the exquisite tribute of the late Margaret J. Preston, whose poetic soul recognized a sister spirit across the gulf of centuries.

VITTORIA COLONNA.

> Serene and sad and still, she sat apart
> In widowed saintliness, an unvowed nun,
> Whose duty to the world without was done;
> And yet concealing with unselfish art
> The scars of grief the pangs of loss, the smart
> Of pain, she suffered not herself to shun
> The hurt, and bruised, and wronged, who, one by one,
> Sought sanctuary of her cloistered heart.
> But to that loneliest soul, who found in her
> His type of womanhood supremest set,
> And knew not whether he should kneel or no,
> Such sweet, strange comfort did she minister,
> That were this deed her all, the world would yet
> Have loved her for the sake of Angelo!

ANNE STUART BAILEY,

710 E. 142nd St., New York City.

## REVIEW OF THE PAULINE CHRONOLOGY.

THERE would be no need of reviewing the Pauline chronology, if the dates of the events in the life of Paul, long regarded as substantially settled, had not been pushed back from three to six years by some of the ablest of our present critics. It is still more remarkable that the new chronology is a natural accompaniment of the present return of historical criticism towards the tradition of the early church. For it claims not only to account more satisfactorily for such traditions as that of St. Peter's activity in Rome and Paul's in Spain, but also to agree more accurately with the conditions presupposed in the Pastoral Epistles and with the express testimony of Eusebius' Chronicon (including the Armenian and Jerome's version, and the Syriac epitome), of the Chronicon Paschale, of Ps.-Chrysostom, and Euthalius. It is true that the old chronology is still followed by Anger,[1] Wieseler,[2] Hofmann,[3] Schürer,[4] and Lightfoot;[5] but following Bengel, Süskind, and Rettig,[6] first the Catholic writers Kellner,[7] and Weber,[8] and afterwards the well-known critics O. Holtzmann[9] and F. Blass,[10] together with the great historian Harnack[11] and his admirers Ramsay[12] and McGiffert[13] applied all the resources of their brilliant scholarship to corroborate the new Pauline chronology. The older theory however has not been left without defence. Not to mention H. Ewald,[14] E. D. Burton,[15] B. W. Bacon,[16] we may state that Ramsay[17] though not an adherent of the traditional chronology, rejects Harnack's principal arguments, and that Zahn[18] vindicates the legitimacy of the old chronology with scrupulous accuracy.

The foregoing writers on the present topic distinguish between a

---

[1] De temp. in Act. ap. ratione, 1833. [2] Chronologie des ap. Zeitalters, 1848. [3] NT V, 11-17.

[4] History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, I. ii, pp. 182 f.

[5] Biblical Essays, 1893, pp. 213-233. [6] Cf. Wieseler, l. c., p. 72.

[7] Hergenröther's Kirchenlexicon, 2 ed., iv. pp. 1311 ff.; Katholik, 1887, first half, pp. 146 ff.; Zeitschr. für kathol. Theol. 1888, pp. 640 ff.

[8] Kritische Gesch. d. Exegese d. 9 Kap. d. Römerbriefs, 1889, pp. 177 ff.

[9] Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, 1895, pp. 125 ff., 248.

[10] Acta Apost., 1895, pp. 21 f.

[11] Chronologie der Altchristlichen Literatur, pp. 233-243.

[12] Paul the Traveller, 1896; Expositor, ser. v., vol. iii., pp. 336, and vol. v., pp. 201 ff.; the writer slightly differs from Harnack.

[13] The American Journal of Theology, I. i. pp. 145 ff.; History of the Apost. Church, pp. 356 ff.

[14] History of Israel, London, 1885, vol. ii., pp. 37-43.

[15] Records and Letters, Chicago, 1896, Note i.

[16] Expositor, 1898, Febr., pp. 123-136.

[17] Expositor, 1897. March, pp. 201-211.

[18] Einleitung in d. Neue Testament, ii. pp. 626 ff., 1899.

relative and an absolute Pauline chronology; the former arranges the events in the apostle's life in chronological order, and determines the length of time which separates one event from the other; the latter connects the series of facts thus obtained with the chronology of general history. There is hardly any substantial difference of opinion concerning the relative chronology of the life of the apostle; still, we cannot omit it entirely in the present paper, since the absolute chronology partly depends on the relative, just as the latter depends on the former with regard to the early life and the last years of Paul.

To begin then at the end, all are agreed that an interval of two years and a half separates the end of Paul's Roman captivity from his departure for Rome;[19] another interval of two years and a half his departure for Rome from his arrest in Jerusalem;[20] one of five years, or according to Ramsay one of five years and a half, his arrest in Jerusalem[21] from his arrival in Corinth;[22] according to the careful estimate of Ramsay two years and a half intervene between the apostle's arrival in Corinth[23] and the beginning of his second missionary journey,[24] or the Council at Jerusalem.[25] The best known portion of Paul's career as described in Acts xv.-xxviii., from the Apostolic Council to the end of his two years' imprisonment in Rome, covers therefore only a period of some twelve or thirteen years.

It is to this twelve or thirteen years' period that we must add the number of years furnished by the apostle himself.[26] Starting from the time of his conversion, he writes: "Neither went I to Jerusalem to the apostles who were before me, but I went into Arabia, and again I returned to Damascus. Then after three years I went to Jerusalem to see Peter, and I tarried with him fifteen days. . . . Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus also with me." Here two questions present themselves: 1. Does the apostle count the fourteen years from the time of his conversion or from the end of the three years after his conversion? 2. Which of his visits to Jerusalem does the apostle place at the end of the fourteen years?

As to the first question, it must be confessed that the text of Gal. naturally leads one to regard the conversion of the apostle, the first visit to Jerusalem, and the second visit as three members of a series[27] separated by three and fourteen years respectively, so that the narrative covers a period of seventeen years.[28] For even if we

[19] Act. xxvii., xxviii. [20] Act. xxi. 17 ff. [21] Act. xxi. 17. [22] Act. xviii. 2.
[23] Act. xviii. 2. [24] Act. xv. 36. [25] Act. xv. 2 ff. [26] Gal. i. 17-ii. 1.
[27] Cf. i. Cor. xv. 4-8. [28] Cf. Zahn, l. c., p. 627.

omit πάλιν in Gal. ii. 1 as is done by Marcion, Irenaeus, Ambrosiaster, and the Coptic version, we still have the double ἔπειτα in Gal. i. 18 and ii. 1, together with the general progressive character of the whole passage which ought not to be abandoned without cogent reasons. If Ramsay and McGiffert insist on the fourteen years' period, they are led to do so not by the text or context of Gal., but by extrinsic considerations the value of which we shall consider presently.

As to the second question, the apostle's visit to Jerusalem mentioned in Gal. ii. 1, cannot be identified with that related in Act xviii. 22; for not to insist on Zahn's contention[29] that in Act xviii. 22, no visit to Jerusalem is mentioned, we may draw attention to the same writer's thesis that the epistle to the Galatians was written before the events related in Acts xviii. 22, and cannot therefore refer to them.[30] Nor can we identify the visit to Jerusalem mentioned in Gal. ii. 1, with that contained in Act xi. 30, xii. 25,[31] for Zahn has pointed out that in this case the subtraction of the seventeen years' period would bring the conversion of the apostle down to A. D. 27; besides Sanday[32] has shown that the apostle's visit to Jerusalem described in Gal. ii. 1-10, does not agree with that related in Act. xi. 30, and xii. 25, since the two visits presuppose wholly different circumstances. Finally, we cannot admit McGiffert's ingenious conjecture that the apostle's visit to Jerusalem for famine relief in Act xi, 30, xii, 25, and that for the settlement of the Judaistic difficulties in Act xv, 1, ff., can be identified, so that the two accounts are merely variant versions of the same event, which the historian failed to recognize as such, and therefore embodied separately in his narrative. On the one hand, the historian so clearly distinguishes the two events that no reader before McGiffert has discovered their identity; if we take the liberty of modifying the narrative of Acts according to subjective conjecture, we may as well dispense with the authority of the whole text. On the other hand, even McGiffert's conjecture does not evade the inconvenience pointed out by Zahn, since the year of the famine cannot be changed to a later period than that fixed by the testimony of profane history.* Paul's visit to Jerusalem spoken of in Gal. ii, 1, is therefore identical with that recorded in Act xv, 1, ff., so that all recent researches have only served to confirm what may be called the traditional opinion on the present question. The so-called relative Pauline chronology then divides the thirty years of the

[29] l. c. ii. p. 350, note 7. [30] Ibid. p. 628. [31] Cf. Ramsay, in Paul the Traveller.
[32] Expositor, fifth series, vol. iii. pp. 81 ff. 253 ff.
*Between A. D. 46 and 48; cf. Zahn, II. p. 631.

historically certain dates of the apostle into the following periods: First, the conversion of the apostle is followed by a visit to Jerusalem after an interval of three years; secondly, fourteen years later we find Paul at the Apostolic Council in Jerusalem; thirdly, after two years and a half more he visits Corinth for the first time; fourthly, five years (and a half) later he is arrested in Jerusalem; fifthly, after a captivity of two years and a half the apostle starts for Rome; finally, Paul's Roman captivity ends after another two years and a half.

But the main difficulty as well as the main interest lie in the determination of the so-called absolute Pauline chronology (we employ the terms "relative" and "absolute" in the accepted meaning, though we think they ought to be used in the respectively opposite signification), or in the connection of the dates of the apostle's life and work with the dates of general history. The links of connection are first, the ethnarch of Aretas who was hostile to Paul at the time of his expulsion from Damascus;[33] secondly, Herod Agrippa i. who appears to give a clue to the time of Paul's visit to Jerusalem related in Act xi. 30, xii. 25; thirdly, Sergius Paulus Roman proconsul of Cyprus at the time of Paul's first missinoary journey;[34] fourthly, the expulsion of the Jews from Rome under Claudius which precedes Paul's first arrival in Corinth;[35] fifthly, Gallio, the proconsul of Achæa, who came into contact with Paul during the latter's stay in Corinth;[36] lastly, the Roman procuators Felix and Festus who are connected with Paul's Cæsarean captivity and his departure for Rome.[37] In the following pages we shall endeavor to briefly review these different data.

1. As to the ethnarch of Aretas, it is immaterial whether we defend the opinion of Marquardt, Mommsen, and others that Damascus belonged to the kingdom of Aretas, at least for a short time, or regard the ethnarch as a kind of Consul General constituted by Aretas to protect the interests of his subjects living in Damascus;[38] for in either case, the term "ethnarch of Aretas" implies that he held office during the latter's lifetime. Now according to the historical data collected by Schürer, Aretas iv. ruled from B. C. 9, till A. D. 40. Though this range is too wide to yield any definite result as to the Pauline chronology, it shows us at any rate that the conversion of the apostle must be placed before A. D. 37, since the hostile relations between the ethnarch of Aretas and Paul occurred on the one hand before A. D. 40 and on the other about three years after the latter's miraculous conversion.

---

[33] II. Cor. xi. 32; Act. ix. 24. [34] Act. xiii. 7-12. [35] Act. xviii. 21.
[36] Act. xviii. 12-17. [37] Act. xxiii. 24, xxvi. 32. [38] Schürer, l. c. I. ii. pp. 354 ff.

2. Herod Agrippa I. obtained the royal title and the dominion of his grandfather[39] from Claudius immediately on his accession (A. D. 41, Jan. 24), and died three years later, A. D. 44,[40]. according to Act xii, 3, 19. some time after the Passover of that year. The chronology of Act xii, 1-23, is therefore settled in so far that we must place the death of James, the imprisonment and miraculous liberation of Peter, and the death of Herod Agrippa in or before A. D. 44; whether the events affecting Peter and James can have occurred A. D. 42,[41] need not be determined here, since it does not bear directly on the Pauline chronology. For according to Act xi. 30, xii. 25, the narrative of the apostle's carrying alms to Jerusalem is somehow connected with all the events contained in Act xii, 1-23. not with one or two incidents only. If we investigate this connection more closely we are confronted at the start with three possibilities: First, the apostle's visit may have preceded the events told in Act xii. 1-23; secondly, it may have been contemporaneous with those events; thirdly, it may have followed them. The first possibility is excluded by the fact that the history of the apostolic visit is interrupted by Act xii. 1-23; for there would have been no good reason for telling part of the visit in xi, 30. part in xii. 25, if the whole visit had been ended before the death of James (Act xii. 1-2.) The second possibility, too, appears to be excluded, since, on the one hand, there is not the slightest sign in the narrative of Acts that Paul and Barnabas witnessed the events contained in Act xii. 1-23, and, on the other, the narrative implies that before the apostolic visit James had been killed, Peter had fled,[42] and the other apostles had left Jerusalem, so that the alms were sent "to the ancients" (not to the apostles of Jerusalem) "by the hands of Barnabas and Saul."[43] While the author of Acts inserts the death of James, the imprisonment of Peter and the death of Herod Agrippa, in his narrative of the apostolic visit to Jerusalem in order to depict the condition of the Church in the Jewish capital at the time of the apostle's arrival, he also implies that Paul visited Jerusalem shortly after the foregoing events, either in the autumn of A. D. 44 or during A. D. 45. These dates are not much modified even if we grant that Paul's visit was contemporaneous with Act xii. 1-23, so that Harnack's opinion, according to which the apostle's visit fell in A. D. 42, is based on the first of the foregoing three possibilities, a view that is wholly improbable if Act xii. 1-23, presents a continuous narrative. Thus

[39] Josephus, Wars, II. xi. 5; Antiquit. XIX. V. i.
[40] Josephus, Wars, II. xi. 6; Antiquit. XIX. viii. 2.
[41] Harnack, Chronologie, pp. 243 f.
[42] Act. xii. 17.
[43] Act. xi. 30.

far, then, we have seen that Paul must have been converted in or before A. D. 37, and must have carried alms to Jerusalem in A. D. 44 or 45; the intervening events will be considered later on.

3. Sergius Paulus, the proconsul of Cyprus, was converted by Paul at the beginning of his first missionary journey,[44] so that his term of office connects the chronology of the apostle with Roman history. We have indeed a Roman inscription according to which Sergius Paulus was "curator riparum et alvei Tiberis,"[45] but its date is uncertain. Another inscription, in which the name of our proconsul occurs has been found at Soloi in Cyprus. The memorial stone bearing the inscription was placed by a certain Apollonius in memory of his parents, and is dated the 25th of Demarchexusios of the year 13 (113 has been substituted by way of merely subjective conjecture); hence it points most probably to the thirteenth year of Claudius, i. e., A. D. 53. It is true that the last two lines and a half in which the name of Sergius Paulus occurs have been written later than the original part of the inscription; but it cannot be maintained that the author of this addition reckoned events from a date different from that contained in the inscription. If, then, Apollonius is said to have been censor of the senate under the proconsulship of Sergius Paulus (*τιμητεύσας τὴν βουλὴν* [*δι*]*ὰ ἐξαστῶν ἐπὶ παύλου* [*ἀνθ*]*υπάτου*) the latter must have held office before A. D. 53. Now in A. D. 52 L. Annius Bassus was proconsul of Cyprus,[46] and his immediate predecessor was Q. Julius Cordus, so that the proconsulship of Sergius Paulus must have occurred before A. D. 51. This result is not very satisfactory, but it fixes the beginning of the apostle's first missionaary journey before A. D. 51.

4. According to Act xviii. 2, Paul on first coming to Corinth found "a certain Jew, named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with Priscilla, his wife (because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome)." It is true that, according to Josephus,[47] and Dio Cassius,[48] Claudius had shown himself very friendly to Agrippa I. and Herod of Chalcis, and had granted the right of a free exercise of their religion to all the Jews of the empire. At the same time, he added the monition to make a modest use of this privilege, and according to Dio Cassius[49] he had forbidden Jewish mob meetings in the very first year of his reign. If then the Jews did not follow these prescriptions, it cannot surprise us that the Roman police lost patience and resorted to more vigorous

[44] Act. xiii. 7-12.
[45] Cf. Prosopographia iii. 221, n. 376.
[46] Corp. inscript. graec. 2632; cf. Plin. ep. vii. 31.
[47] Antiquit. XIX. v. 1-3.
[48] 60, 8, 2.
[49] 60, 6, 6.

that the Roman police lost patience and restored to more vigorous measures, such as are attested by Suetonius,[50] the Doctrina Addai,[51] by Eusebius,[52] and Orosius.[53] But the year of the expulsion of the Jews from Rome cannot be determined from any of these authorities; Orosius professes to give the ninth year of Claudius on the testimony of Josephus, which cannot be found anywhere. The favors bestowed by Claudius on Agrippa II. during the years 50-54 do not prove that the edict of expulsion was not issued at that period,[54] since they do not imply that Claudius was at that time a friend of all Jews. While, therefore, Act xviii. 2, is confirmed by the testimony of profane history, its chronology cannot be determined from this source.

5. According to Act xviii. 12-17, "when Gallio was proconsul of Achaia, the Jews, with one accord, rose up against Paul, and brought him to the judgment seat, etc." Lucius Junius Gallio, whose former name had been Annæus Novatus, was the adoptive son of the rhetorician Gallio and the elder brother of the philosopher Seneca. The latter's exile, which ended A. D. 49, did not interrupt the career of Gallio,[55] so that he must have been consul before Seneca, A. D. 56. We know that Gallio must have become proconsul of Achaia during Paul's first stay at Corinth, since the author of Acts determines the time of Paul's trial by the beginning of Gallio's proconsulship. Seneca [56] tells us that his brother once left Achaia in order to recover from a fever; Pliny[57] relates that after his consulship he made a voyage to Egypt in order to counteract the effects of a hemorrhage; finally, Dio Cassius[58] places his death in the reign of Nero, and Tacitus[57] does not help us to determine the year more accurately. Here again, then, the narrative of Acts is confirmed by profane history, but no light is thrown on the general Pauline chronology.

6. According to Act xxiii. 24-xxvi. 32, Paul began his Cæsarean captivity under the procurator Felix, and was sent to Rome by the procurator Festus shortly after his accession to office. It is from the dates of these events that the defenders of the old chronology and the patrons of the new draw their arguments. Instead of enumerating all the arguments for the one side and the other, we shall endeavor to establish first the latest possible date and then the earliest possible of Pauline chronology, stating the views and arguments of the principal writers on this subject as we proceed in our discussion.

---

[50] Claudius, 25. [51] Ed. Philipps, p. 16. [52] Hist. eccl. II. xviii. 9.
[53] Hist. VII. vi. 15. [54] Cf. O. Holtzmann, p. 127. [55] Seneca, dial. xii. 18, 2.
[56] Epist. xviii. 1. [57] H. n. xxxi. 62. [58] 62, 25. [59] Ann. xv. 73.

1.] Paul cannot have come to Rome later than in the spring of A. D. 61. For in the first place, according to Josephus,[60] Albinus, the successor of Festus in the procuratorship of Judea, was present in Jerusalem for the feast of Tabernacles four years before the beginning of the Jewish war and seven years and five months before a point of time that shortly preceded the destruction of the city, both of which indications point to A. D. 62; in the context Josephus mentions events that occurred at the Passover and the feast of Pentecost of the same year, but does not connect the name of Albinus with them. The same visit of Albinus to Jerusalem on occasion of the feast of tabernacles appears to be referred to by Josephus in his Antiquities,[61] and the whole trend of this latter passage shows that Albinus made the visit shortly after his arrival in Cæsarea, so that he must have begun his office in September, A. D. 62. Again, the same passage attests that Festus, Albinus's predecessor, had died some three months before the latter's coming, i. e., in May or June, A. D. 62. Now, though the office term of Festus was short,[62] it cannot be compressed into the space of ten months, so that Festus must have become procurator before the summer of 61. Since then, according to the author of the Acts, Festus began his procuratorship in summer, he must have come to Palestine in summer A. D. 60 at the latest. Reckoning, therefore, from the latest possible period, Paul must have been sent to Rome in the autumn of A. D. 60, and must have arrived in Rome in March, A. D. 61.

This result is confirmed by the following consideration:[63] According to an old reading of Act xxviii, 16, Paul was delivered to the Præfectus prætorio when he arrived in Rome. Now, though the author of Acts may be somewhat obscure in this passage, still the reader naturally infers from the passage that at the time of Paul's arrival in Rome there was only one Præfectus prætorio. Had he arrived in the spring of A. D. 62 he would have found two of these officials; for two began to hold office after the death of Burrus, which occurred in the beginning of A. D. 62.[64] According to this reckoning, then, Paul ended his Roman captivity A. D. 63 (or in the beginning of 64), departed for Rome in autumn, A. D. 60, was made prisoner in Jerusalem on the feast of Pentecost A. D. 58, visited Corinth for the first time A. D. 53, was present at the Apostolic Council in Jerusalem A. D. 51 (or A. D. 50), and was converted to Christianity A. D. 34 (or 33.) These dates form the outlines of the so-called old chronology.

---

[60] Wars, VI. v. 3. [61] XX. ix. 1-3. [62] Joseph. Wars, II. xiv. 1.
[63] Cf. Wieseler, Chronolog. d. AG., p. 86. [64] Cf. Tac. ann. xiv. 51; Dio Cass. 62, 13.

2.] Paul cannot have arrived in Rome earlier than March, A. D. 59. In the first place Josephus[65] relates the mission of Felix as procurator to Palestine as the last event in the reign of Claudius,[66] and he places all he tells of Felix's procuratorship[67] after the accession of Nero[68]. The same writer[69] implies that Nero confirmed the appointment of Felix, but he does not distinctly state at what precise period the office was transferred from Felix to Festus.[70] In the parallel account [71] we find a substantial agreement with the foregoing statements. According to Josephus therefore Felix became procurator in one of the last years of Claudius, some time between A. D. 51 and 54, and was confirmed in his office by Nero immediately after his accession to the imperial dignity, Oct. 13, A. D. 54. If we compare Act xxiv. 10, with xxiv. 27, we must assign to Felix a term of at least six years, and though some of this time may fall in the reign of Claudius, still according to the foregoing data it is not probable that this amounted to more than two years. Felix must, therefore, have remained in Palestine till summer, A. D. 58, so that his successor cannot have sent Paul to Rome earlier than in the autumn of the same year, and the apostle cannot have reached Rome before spring, A. D. 59.

This clear chronology of Josephus is obscured by the writer himself. When Felix, after his recall to Rome, was accused by the Jews, Pallas secured his acquittal,[72] being just then (*μάλιστα δὴ τότε*) in high favor at the court of Nero. But Pallas had clearly fallen into disfavor in the beginning of Nero's reign, A. D. 55,[73] shortly before the fourteenth birthday of Brittanicus,[74] who was born on the twentieth day of the reign of Claudius, i. e., Feb. 12 or 13, A. D. 41.[75] Hence Felix must have been recalled before A. D. 55. It is precisely on this statement of Joseph that O. Holtzmann[76] and Harnack[77] partly base their new chronology, with this difference, however, that Harnack assumes for his own convenience that Tacitus must have made a mistake of a year in the age of Britannicus.[78].

Considering the testimony of Josephus in itself, it is less probable that the writer should make a mistake in the history of events that occurred in Palestine, under his own eyes, than in unimportant details which he relates about distant Rome. Supposing, then, the existence of a mistake in the present history of Josephus, the error lies in the details concerning Pallas not in the dates of the Pales-

[65] Wars, II. xii. 8. [66] Wars, II. xi. 1-12, 8. [67] Wars, II. xiii. 2-7.
[68] Wars, II. xii. 8. [69] Wars, II. xiii. 2. [70] Wars, II. xiv. 1.
[71] Antiquit. XX. vii. 1-8, 9. [72] Antiquit. XX. viii. 9. [73] Tacitus, Annal. xiii. 14
[74] Annal. xiii. 15. [75] Suet. Claud. 27. [76] Pp. 128 139.
[77] Pp. 237-238. [78] Zahn, ii. p. 636.

tinian procurators. And this the more since Felix cannot have returned to Rome before the fall of his brother Pallas, i. e.. before A. D. 55. For according to the author of Acts[79] Festus succeeded Felix during the summer season, so that the latter must have left Palestine in summer, A. D. 54, and must have been followed by his Jewish accusers before the winter of the same year. Now, Nero began to reign Oct. 13, A. D. 54; hence, Claudius must have recalled Felix, Claudius must have appointed Festus, and on his return to Rome Felix must have found Claudius still alive, all of which conclusions are false. We need not even admit a substantial error in Josephus as far as the present events are concerned. We know from Tacitus[80] that in the very year of his fall from favor Pallas retained influence enough to secure a sentence of "not guilty" from charges that had been brought up against him. And though his influence over Nero may never have been very great,[81] he certainly could effect for his brother what he was able to do for himself; especially since in the course of time the first effects of his disgrace would wear off, and his millions would give him a proportionate authority in the Roman commonwealth down to the year of his death by poison, A. D. 62.[82]

According to the consistent chronology of Josephus, therefore, Paul can not have reached Rome before the spring of A. D. 59. Tacitus[83] confirms this chronology; for he places the trial of Cumanus, which immediately preceded the appointment of Felix, in A. D. 52, so that according to Tacitus, Felix must have become procurator of Judea late in the same year or in A. D. 53. Adding the least possible number of years during which Felix must have been procurator, we arrive at A. D. 58 or 59; making then due allowance for the appointment of Festus, we see again that Paul can not have been sent to Rome before the autumn of A. D. 58, and cannot have arrived in the city before A. D. 59. It is true that, according to Tacitus, Felix had been ruling even before the trial of Cumanus together with the latter. But not to speak of the strange fact that in the division of Palestine, as found in Tacitus, the most important part, Judea, is wholly omitted, we must draw attention to the testimony of Josephus,[84] according to which it was owing to the intercession of the high priest Jonathan that Felix was appointed procurator after Cumanus. Though Felix may have filled the post of an underling during the term of Cumanus (iam pridem Iudaeae impositus), and thus won the favor of the

[79] xxiv. 27; cf. xx. 17; xxvii. 9.
[80] Annal. xiii. 23.
[81] Tacit. annal. xiii. 2.
[82] Tacit. annal. xiv. 65.
[83] Annal. xii. 54.
[84] Antiquit. XX. viii. 5; Wars, II. xii. 6.

high priest, his proconsulship cannot have coincided with that of his predecessor Cumanus. In Palestinian affairs, therefore, it is in the light of the more detailed history of Josephus that the more general narrative of Tacitus must be interpreted.

The arrival of Paul in Rome A. D. 59 agrees with two other facts better than any earlier date of this event would do. First, according to Act xxiv. 24, Felix was married to Drusilla when Paul spoke before him at the beginning of his Palestinian captivity. Now Drusilla had been the wife of Aziz of Emesa,[85] and has been induced by Felix to leave her husband in order to live with himself. Her marriage with Aziz had taken place after her brother Agrippa II. had obtained from Claudius the former dominion of Philip, A. D. 53. It must have taken some time before the newly married woman tired of her first husband sufficiently to abandon him entirely for the Roman procurator. Again, there is not the least indication in Act xxiv. 24, that Drusilla had been lately married to Felix; the text produces rather the contrary impression. It is, therefore, highly improbable that the time between the first marriage of Drusilla and her appearance before Paul extends to less than three years, so that she cannot have heard Paul before A. D. 58, and the latter cannot have been sent to Rome before A. D. 58.

The second fact that demands the year 59 as the earliest possible of Paul's coming to Rome is also based on Josephus.[86] After completing his twenty-sixth year the writer went to Rome in order to secure the liberty of several Jewish priests that had been sent there for trial by the procurator Felix. If Paul had come to Rome before A. D. 59, in other words, if Felix had ceased to be procurator before A. D. 58, these priests would have been kept prisoners in Rome awaiting their sentence for more than six years. If the reader considers it improbable that Rome should have delayed her justice for the period of six years, he may extend the term of Felix down to the summer of A. D. 60; but there is hardly any probability that it will have to be pushed in the opposite direction.

Harnack[87] urges against our conclusion (1) the authority of Eusebius; (2) the authority of Josephus as studied in the light of Tacitus. As to the latter argument, we have seen already that Harnack reads Josephus' account of Palestinian affairs in the light of Tacitus' account of the same, and Tacitus' account of Roman affairs in the light of Josephus' views on Rome. It would be as reasonable to correct the home news of our daily papers according to the European reports of the same, and, vice versa, to modify the home news of the European dailies according to the European

[85] Cf. Joseph. Antiquit. XX. vii. 1-2. [86] Vit. 3. [87] Pp. 233 ff.

news in American papers. Hence we need only add a word about the authority of Eusebius.

In the Chronicle of Eusebius, according to the Armenian text, it is said that the recall of Felix took place in the last year of Claudius, A. D. 54;[88] in the Chronicle of Jerome it is placed in the second year of Nero.[89] All apear to agree that in the Armenian text there exists a confusion on the present subject, and that its dates must be corrected according to Jerome's Latin edition,[90] and Euthalius,[91] so that, according to the true reading of Eusebius, Festus succeeded Felix A. D. 56. Arranging all the dates of Pauline chronology consistently with the given year, we obtain the following series: Paul ended his Roman captivity, A. D. 59; came to Rome in the spring of A. D. 57; was taken prisoner in Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost, A. D. 54; came first to Corinth, A. D. 49; attended the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem, A. D. 47; was converted to Christianity, A. D. 30. These dates constitute the outline of the so-called new Pauline chronology.

In the first place, we may draw attention to the fact that according to the critically determined chronology of Eusebius, which is confirmed by the same writer's Ecclesiastical History,[92] the procuratorship of Felix reached into the reign of Nero; this is an additional proof that Harnack and Holtzmann are wrong in their interpretation of the text of Josephus concerning Pallas since according to this interpretation Felix's successor would have been appointed by Claudius. In the second place, it has been shown in the preceding pages that Josephus, Tacitus, and the author of Acts do not permit us to place the recall of Felix as early as A. D. 56, a conclusion confirmed by the chronology of two historical facts whose dates demand a later departure of Felix from Palestine. Are we then to be deaf to the unanimous voice of practically contemporaneous witnesses as to the date of the recall of Felix, and listen to the testimony of a fourth century writer in preference, a writer whose testimony is not textually certain in the present case, a writer whose testimony is not testually certain in the present case, a writer again whose testimony, even when it is textually certain, is acknowledged to be "often quite arbitrary?" We have seen above that Harnack prefers the testimony of a witness not locally present to that of an eye-witness; now we see that Harnack prefers the testimony of the fourth century after the event to that of the living age in which the event occurs.

---

[88] Euseb. Chronicon. ed. Schoene, ii. 152. [89] Ibid. p. 155.
[90] Cf. Vir. ill. 7. [91] Cf. Zacagni, Monum. p. 531.
[92] II. xx. 1; xxii. 1.

3.] Thus far we have come to the conclusion that Paul cannot have come to Rome later than A. D. 61 or earlier than A. D. 59. If the reader will consider the series of arguments we have given for the one conclusion and the other, he will perceive that the arguments for the latest possible term do not urge us as much to push the date upwards as the argumens for the earliest possible term incline us to push the date downwards. It is for this reason that the so-called old chronology is right in assuming A. D. 61 as the year of the apostle's arrival in Rome, and in arranging the other dates accordingly. This does not touch the question of Paul's death, or rather of its place and time. But these points demand a separate paper, so that we now leave the apostle where the author of Acts leaves him, i. e., at the end of his Roman captivity.

Rev. A. J. Maas, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

---

## SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI LEONIS DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE XIII LITTERAE ENCYCLICAE.

### AD PATRIARCHAS PRIMATES ARCHIEPISCOPOS EPISCOPOS ALIOSQVE LOCORVM ORDINARIOS

### PACEM ET COMMVNIONEM CVM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTES

### DE HOMINIBVS SACRATISSIMO CORDI IESV DEVOVENDIS

ANNUM Sacrum, more institutoque maiorum in hac alma Urbe proxime celebrandum, per apostolicas Litteras, ut probe nostis, nuperrime indiximus. Hodierno autem die, in spem auspiciumque peragendae sanctius religiosissimae celebritatis, auctores suasoresque sumus praeclarae cuiusdam rei, ex qua quidem, si modo omnes ex animo, si consentientibus libentibusque voluntatibus paruerint, primum quidem nomini christiano, deinde societati hominum universae fructus insignes non sine caussa expectamus eosdemque mansuros.

Probatissimam religionis formam, quae in cultu Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu versatur, sancte tueri ac maiore in lumine collocare non semel conati sumus, exemplo Decessorum Nostrorum Innocentii XII, Benedicti XIII, Clementis XIII, Pii VI eodemque nomine VII ac IX: idque maxime per Decretum egimus die XXVIII Iunii mensis an. MDCCCLXXXIX datum, quo scilicet Festum eo titulo

ad ritum primae classis eveximus. Nunc vero luculentior quaedam obsequii forma obversatur animo, quae scilicet honorum omnium, quotquot Sacratissimo Cordi haberi consueverunt, velut absolutio perfectioque sit: eamque Iesu Christo Redemptori pergratam fore confidimus. Quamquam haec, de qua loquimur, haud sane nunc primum mota res est. Etenim abhinc quinque ferme lustris, cum saecularia solemnia imminerent iterum instauranda postea quam mandatum de cultu divini Cordis propagando beata Margarita Maria de Alacoque divinitus acceperat, libelli supplices non a privatis tantummodo, sed etiam ab Episcopis ad Pium IX in id undique missi complures, ut communitatem generis humani devovere augustissimo Cordi Iesu vellet. Differri placuit rem, quo decerneretur maturius: interim devovendi sese singillatim civitatibus data factulta volentibus, praescriptaque devotionis formula. Novis nunc accedentibus caussis, maturitatem venisse rei perficiendae iudicamus.

Atque amplissimum istud maximumque obsequii et pietatis testimonium omnino convenit Iesu Christo, quia ipse princeps est ac dominus summus. Videlicet imperium eius non est tantummodo in gentes catholici nominis, aut in eos solum, qui sacro baptismate rite abluti, utique ad Ecclesiam, si spectetur ius, pertinent, quamvis vel error opinionum devios agat, vel dissensio a caritate seiungat: sed complectitur etiam quotquot numerantur christianae fidei expertes, ita ut verissime in potestate Iesu Christi sit universitas generis humani. Nam qui Dei Patris Unigenitus est, eamdemque habet cum ipso substantiam, *splendor gloriae et figura substantiae eius*[1], huic omnia cum Patre communia esse necesse est, proptereaque quoque rerum omnium summum imperium. Ob eam rem Dei Filius de se ipse apud Prophetam, *Ego autem*, effatur, *constitutus sum rex super Sion montem sanctum eius. — Dominus dixit ad me: Filus meus es tu, ego hodie genui te. Postula a me, et dabo Tibi gentes hereditatem tuam et possessionem tuam terminos terrae*[2]. Quibus declarat, se potestatem a Deo accepisse cum in omnem Ecclesiam quae per Sion montem intelligitur, tum in reliquum terrarum orbem, qua eius late termini proferuntur. Quo autem summa ista potestas fundamento nitatur, satis illa docent, *Filius meus es tu.* Hoc enim ipso quod omnium Regis est Filius, universae potestatis est heres: ex quo illa, *dabo Tibi hereditatem tuam.* Quorum sunt ea similia, quae habet Paulus apostolus: *Quem constituit heredem universorum*[3].

Illud autem considerandum maxime, quid affirmaverit de imperio

---

[1] Hebr. i, 3. [2] Ps. ii. [3] Heb. i, 2.

suo Iesus Christus non iam per apostolos aut prophetas, sed suis ipse verbis. Quaerenti enim romano Praesidi: *ergo rex es tu?* sine ulla dubitatione respondit: *tu dicis quia rex sum ego*[4]. Atque huius magnitudinem potestatis et infinitatem regni illa ad Apostolos apertius confirmant: *Data est mihi omnis potestas in caelo et in terra*[5]. Si Christo data potestas omnis, necessario consequitur, imperium eius summum esse oportere, absolutum, arbitrio nullius obnoxium, nihil ut ei sit nec par nec simile: cumque data sit in caelo et in terra, debet sibi habere caelum terrasque parentia. Re autem vera ius istud singulare sibique proprium exercuit, iussis nimirum Apostolis evulgare doctrinam suam, congregare homines in unum corpus Ecclesiae per lavacrum salutis, leges denique imponere, quas recusare sine salutis sempiternae discrimine nemo posset.

Neque tamen sunt in hoc omnia. Imperat Christus non iure tantum nativo, quippe Dei Unigenitus, sed etiam quaesito. Ipse enim eripuit nos *de potestate tenebrarum*[6], idemque *dedit redemptionem semetipsum pro omnibus*[7]. Ei ergo facti sunt *populus acquisitionis*[8] non solum et catholici et quotquot christianum baptisma rite accepere, sed homines singuli et universi. Quam in rem apte Augustinus: *quaeritis*, inquit, *quid emerit? Videte quid dederit, et invenietis quid emerit. Sanguis Christi pretium est. Tanti quid valet? quid, nisi totus mundus? quid, nisi omnes gentes? Pro toto dedit, quantum dedit*[9].

Cur autem ipsi infideles potestate dominatuque Iesu Christi teneantur, caussam sanctus Thomas rationemque, edisserendo, docet. Cum enim de iudiciali eius potestate quaesisset, num ad homines porrigatur universos, affirmassetque, *indiciaria potestas consequitur potestatem regiam*, plane concludit: *Christo omnia sunt subiecta quantum ad potestatem, etsi nondum sunt ei subiecta quantum ad executionem potestatis*[10]. Quae Christi potestas et imperium in homines exercetur per veritatem, per iustitiam, maxime per caritatem.

Verum ad istud potestatis dominationisque suae fundamentum duplex benigne ipse sinit ut accedat a nobis, si libet, devotio voluntaria. Porro Iesus Christus, Deus idem ac Redemptor, omnium est rerum cumulata perfectaque possessione locuples: nos autem adeo inopes atque egentes ut, quo eum munerari liceat, de nostro quidem suppetat nihil. Sed tamen pro summa bonitate et caritate sua minime recusat quin sibi, quod suum est, perinde demus, addicamus, ac iuris nostri foret: nec solum non recusat, sed expetit ac rogat: *Fili praebe cor tuum mihi.* Ergo gratificari illi utique pos-

[4] I oan. xviii, 37. [5] Matt. xxviii, 18. [6] Coloss. i, 13.
[7] I. Tim. ii, 6. [8] I Petr. ii, 9. [9] Tract. 120 in Ioan. [10] 3a p. q. 59, a. 4.

sumus voluntate atque affectione animi. Nam ipsi devovendo nos, non modo et agnoscimus et accipimus imperium eius aperte ac libenter: sed re ipsa testamur, si nostrum id esset quod dono damus, summa nos voluntate daturos; ac petere ab eo ut id ipsum, etsi plane suum, tamen accipere a nobis ne gravetur. Haec vis rei est, de qua agimus, haec Nostris subiecta verbis sententia. — Quoniamque inest in Sacro Corde symbolum atque expressa imago infinitae Iesu Christi caritatis, quae movet ipsa nos ad amandum mutuo, ideo consentaneum est dicare se Cordi eius augustissimo: quod tamen nihil est aliud quam dedere atque obligare se Iesu Christo, quia quidquid honoris, obsequii, pietatis divino Cordi tribuitur, vere et proprie Christo tribuitur ipsi.

Itaque ad istiusmodi devotionem voluntate suscipiendam excitamus cohortamurque quotquot divinissimum Cor et noscant et diligant: ac valde velimus, eodem id singulos die efficere, ut tot millium idem voventium animorum significationes uno omnes tempore ad caeli templa pervehantur. — Verum numne elabi animo patiemur innumerabiles alios, quibus christiana veritas nondum affulsit? Atqui eius persona geritur a Nobis, qui venit salvum facere quod perierat, quique totius humani generis saluti addixit sanguinem suum. Propterea eos ipsos qui in umbra mortis sedent, quemadmodum excitare ad eam, quae vere vita est, assidue studemus, Christi nuntiis in omnes partes ad erudiendum dimissis, ita nunc, eorum miserati vicem, Sacratissimo Cordi Iesu commendamus maiorem in modum et, quantum in Nobis est, dedicamus. — Qua ratione haec, quam cunctis suademus, cunctis est profutura devotio. Hoc enim facto, in quibus est Iesu Christi cognitio et amor, ii facile sentient sibi fidem amoremque crescere. Qui, Christo cognito, praecepta tamen eius legemque negligunt, iis fas erit e Sacro Corde flammam caritatis arripere. Iis demum longe miseris, qui caeca superstitione conflictantur, caeleste auxilium uno omnes animo flagitabimus, ut eos Iesus Christus, sicut iam sibi habet subiectos *secundum potestatem*, subiiciat aliquando *secundum executionem potestatis*, neque solum *in futuro saeculo, quando de omnibus voluntatem suam implebit, quosdam quidem salvando, quosdam puniendo*[11], sed in hac etiam vita mortali, fidem scilicet ac sanctitatem impertiendo; quibus illi virtutibus colere Deum queant, uti par est, et ad sempiternam in caelo felicitatem contendere.

Cuiusmodi dedicatio spem quoque civitatibus affert rerum meliorum, cum vincula instaurare aut firmius possit adstringere,

[11] S. Thom. l. c.

quae res publicas naturâ iungunt Deo. — Novissimis hisce temporibus id maxime actum, ut Ecclesiam inter ac rem civilem quasi murius intersit. In constitutione atque administratione civitatum pro nihilo habetur sacri divinique iuris auctoritas, eo proposito ut communis vitae consuetudinem nulla vis religionis attingat. Quod huc ferme recidit, Christi fidem de medio tollere, ipsumque, si fieri posset, terris exigere Deum. Tanta insolentia elatis animis, quid mirum quod humana gens pleraque in eam inciderit rerum perturbationem iisque iactetur fluctibus, qui metu et periculo vacuum sinant esse neminem? Certissima incolumitatis publicae firmamenta dilabi necesse est, religione posthabita. Poenas autem Deus de perduellibus iustas meritasque sumpturus, tradidit eos suae ipsorum libidini, ut serviant cupiditatibus ac sese ipsi nimia libertate conficiant.

Hinc vis illa malorum quae iamdiu insident, quaeque vehementer postulant, ut unius auxilium exquiratur, cuius virtute depellantur. Quisnam autem ille sit, praeter Iesum Christum Unigenitum Dei? *Neque enim aliud nomen est sub caelo datum hominibus, in quo oporteat nos salvos fieri*[12]. Ad illum ergo confugiendum, qui est *via, veritas et vita.* Erratum est: redeundum in viam: obductae mentibus tenebrae: discutienda caligo luce veritatis: mors occupavit: apprehendenda vita. Tum denique licebit sanari tot vulnera, tum ius omne in pristinae auctoritatis spem revirescet, et restituentur ornamenta pacis, atque excident gladii fluentque arma de manibus, cum Christi imperium omnes accipient libentes eique parebunt, *atque omnis lingua* confitebitur *quia Dominus Iesus Christus in gloria est Dei Patris*[13].

Cum Ecclesia per proxima originibus tempora caesareo iugo premeretur, conspecta sublime adolescenti imperatori crux, amplissimae victoriae, quae mox est consecuta, auspex simul atque effectrix. En alterum hodie oblatum oculis auspicatissimum divinissimumque signum: videlicet Cor Iesu sacratissimum, superimposita cruce, splendidissimo candore inter flammas elucens. In eo omnes collocandae spes: ex eo hominum petenda atque expectanda salus.

Denique, id quod praeterire silentio nolumus, illa quoque caussa, privatim quidem Nostra, sed satis iusta et gravis, ad rem suscipiendam impulit, quod bonorum omnium auctor Deus Nos haud ita pridem, periculoso depulso morbo, conservavit. Cuius tanti beneficii auctis nunc per Nos Sacratissimo Cordi honoribus, et memoriam publice extare volumes et gratiam.

---

[12] Act. iv, 12. [13] Phil. ii, 11.

Itaque edicimus ut diebus nono, decimo, undecimo proximi mensis Iunii, in suo cuiusque urbis atque oppidi templo principe statae supplicationes fiant, perque singulos eos dies ad ceteras preces Litaniae Sanctissimi Cordis adiiciantur auctoritate Nostra probatae: postremo autem die formula Consecrationis recitetur: quam vobis formulam, Venerabiles Fratres, una cum his litteris mittimus.

Divinorum munerum auspicem benevolentiaeque Nostrae testem vobis et clero populoque, cui praeestis, apostolicam benedictionem peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum die xxv Maii, An. MDCCCLXXXXIX, Pontificatus Nostri vicesimo secundo.

LEO PP. XIII.

---

## ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF OUR HOLY FATHER, LEO XIII., BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE.

### TO THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF THE CATHOLIC WORLD IN GRACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE,

### ON THE CONSECRATION OF MANKIND TO THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS.

*To Our Venerable Brethren, the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops and Bishops of the Catholic World in Grace and Communion with the Apostolic See.*

POPE LEO XIII.

*Venerable Brethren, Health and Apostolic Benediction.*

BUT a short time ago, as you well know, We, by letters apostolic, and following the custom and ordinances of Our predecessors, commanded the celebration in this city, at no distant date, of a Holy Year. And now to-day, in the hope and with the object that this religious celebration shall be more devoutly performed, We have traced and recommended a striking design from which, if all shall follow it out with hearty good will, We not unreasonably expect extraordinary and lasting benefits for Christendom in the first place and also for the whole human race.

Already more than once We have endeavored, after the example of Our predecessors Innocent XII., Benedict XIII., Clement XIII.,

Pius VI., and Pius IX., devoutly to foster and bring out into fuller light that most excellent form of devotion which has for its object the veneration of the Sacred Heart of Jesus; this We did especially by the Decree given on June 28, 1889, by which We raised the Feast under that name to the dignity of the first class. But now We have in mind a more signal form of devotion which shall be in a manner the crowning perfection of all the honors that people have been accustomed to pay to the Sacred Heart, and which We confidently trust will be most pleasing to Jesus Christ, our Redeemer. This is not the first time, however, that the design of which We speak has been mooted. Twenty-five years ago, on the approach of the solemnities of the second centenary of the Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque's reception of the Divine command to propagate the worship of the Sacred Heart, many letters from all parts, not merely from private persons but from Bishops also were sent to Pius IX. begging that he would consent to consecrate the whole human race to the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus. It was thought best at the time to postpone the matter in order that a well-considered decision might be arrived at. Meanwhile permission was granted to individual cities which desired it thus to consecrate themselves, and a form of consecration was drawn up. Now, for certain new and additional reasons, We consider that the plan is ripe for fulfilment.

This world-wide and solemn testimony of allegiance and piety is especially appropriate to Jesus Christ, who is the Head and Supreme Lord of the race. His empire extends not only over Catholic nations and those who, having been duly washed in the waters of holy baptism, belong of right to the Church, although erroneous opinions keep them astray, or dissent from her teaching cuts them off from her care; it comprises also all those who are deprived of the Christian faith, so that the whole human race is most truly under the power of Jesus Christ. For He who is the Only-begotten Son of God the Father, having the same substance with Him and being the brightness of His glory and the figure of His substance (Hebrew i., 3) necessarily has everything in common with the Father, and therefore sovereign power over all things. This is why the Son of God thus speaks of Himself through the Prophet: "But I am appointed king by him over Sion, his holy mountain. . . . The Lord said to me, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession" (Psalm, ii.). By these words He declares that He has power from God over the whole Church, which is signified by

Mount Sion, and also over the rest of the world to its uttermost ends. On what foundation this sovereign power rests is made sufficiently plain by the words, "Thou art My Son." For by the very fact that He is the Son of the King of all, He is also the heir of all His Father's power: hence the words—"I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance," which are similar to those used by Paul the Apostle, "whom he hath appointed heir of all things" (Hebrews i., 2).

But we should now give most special consideration to the declarations made by Jesus Christ, not through the Apostles or the Prophets but by His own words. To the Roman Governor who asked Him, "Art thou a king then?" He answered unhesitatingly, "Thou sayest that I am a king" (John xviii. 37). And the greatness of this power and the boundlessness of His kingdom is still more clearly declared in these words to the Apostles: "All power is given to me in heaven and on earth" (Matthew xxviii., 18). If then all power has been given to Christ it follows of necessity that His empire must be supreme, absolute and independent of the will of any other, so that none is either equal or like unto it: and since it has been given in heaven and on earth it ought to have heaven and earth obedient to it. And verily he has acted on this extraordinary and peculiar right when He commanded His Apostles to preach His doctrine over the earth, to gather all men together into the one body of the Church by the baptism of salvation, and to bind them by laws, which no one could reject without risking his eternal salvation.

But this is not all. Christ reigns not only by natural right as the Son of God, but also by a right that He has acquired. For He it was who snatched us "from the power of darkness" (Colossians i., 13), and "gave Himself for the redemption of all" (1 Timothy ii., 6). Therefore not only Catholics, and those who have duly received Christian baptism, but also all men, individually and collectively, have become to Him "a purchased people" (1 Peter ii., 9). St. Augustine's words are therefore to the point when he says: "You ask what price He paid? See what He gave and you will understand how much He paid. The price was the blood of Christ. What could cost so much but the whole world, and all its people? The great price He paid was paid for all" (T. 120 on St. John).

How it comes about that infidels themselves are subject to the power and dominion of Jesus Christ is clearly shown by St. Thomas, who gives us the reason and its explanation. For having put the question whether His judicial power extends to all men, and having stated that judicial authority flows naturally from royal

authority, he concludes decisively as follows: "All things are subject to Christ as far as His power is concerned, although they are not all subject to Him in the exercise of that power" (3a., p., q. 59, a. 4). This sovereign power of Christ over men is exercised by truth, justice, and above all, by charity.

To this twofold ground of His power and domination He graciously allows us, if we think fit, to add voluntary consecration. Jesus Christ, our God and our Redeemer, is rich in the fullest and perfect possession of all things: we, on the other hand, are so poor and needy that we have nothing of our own to offer Him as a gift. But yet, in His infinite goodness and love, He in no way objects to our giving and consecrating to Him what is already His, as if it were really our own; nay, far from refusing such an offering, He positively desires it and asks for it: "My son, give me thy heart." We are, therefore, able to be pleasing to Him by the good will and the affection of our soul. For by consecrating ourselves to Him we not only declare our open and free acknowledgment and acceptance of His authority over us, but we also testify that if what we offer as a gift were really our own, we would still offer it with our whole heart. We also beg of Him that He would vouchsafe to receive it from us, though clearly His own. Such is the efficacy of the act of which We speak, such is the meaning underlying Our words.

And since there is in the Sacred Heart a symbol and a sensible image of the infinite love of Jesus Christ which moves us to love one another, therefore is it fit and proper that we should consecrate ourselves to His most Sacred Heart—an act which is nothing else than an offering and a binding of oneself to Jesus Christ, seeing that whatever honor, veneration and love is given to this divine Heart is really and truly given to Christ Himself.

For these reasons We urge and exhort all who know and love this divine Heart willingly to undertake this act of piety; and it is Our earnest desire that all should make it on the same day, that so the aspirations of so many thousands who are performing this act of consecration may be borne to the temple of heaven on the same day. But shall We allow to slip from Our remembrance those innumerable others upon whom the light of Christian truth has not yet shined? We hold the place of Him who came to save that which was lost, and who shed His blood for the salvation of the whole human race. And so We greatly desire to bring to the true life those who sit in the shadow of death. As we have already sent messengers of Christ over the earth to instruct them, so now, in pity for their lot with all Our soul we commend them, and as

far as in Us lies We consecrate them to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. In this way this act of devotion, which We recommend, will be a blessing to all. For having performed it, those in whose hearts are the knowledge and love of Jesus Christ will feel that faith and love increased. Those who knowing Christ, yet neglect His law and its precepts, may still gain from His Sacred Heart the flame of charity. And lastly, for those still more unfortunate, who are struggling in the darkness of superstition, we shall all with one mind implore the assistance of heaven that Jesus Christ, to whose power they are subject, may also one day render them submissive to its exercise; and that not only in the life to come when He will fulfil His will upon all men, by saving some and punishing others, (St. Thomas, *ibid*), but also in this mortal life by giving them faith and holiness. May they by these virtues strive to honor God as they ought, and to win everlasting happiness in heaven.

Such an act of consecration, since it can establish or draw tighter the bonds which naturally connect public affairs with God, gives to States a hope of better things. In these latter times especially, a policy has been followed which has resulted in a sort of wall being raised between the Church and civil society. In the constitution and administration of States the authority of sacred and divine law is utterly disregarded, with a view to the exclusion of religion from having any constant part in public life. This policy almost tends to the removal of the Christian faith from our midst, and, if that were possible, of the banishment of God Himself from the earth. When men's minds are raised to such a height of insolent pride, what wonder is it that the greater part of the human race should have fallen into such disquiet of mind and be buffeted by waves so rough that no one is suffered to be free from anxiety and peril? When religion is once discarded it follows of necessity that the surest foundations of the public welfare must give way, whilst God, to inflict on His enemies the punishment they so richly deserve, has left them the prey of their own evil desires, so that they give themselves up to their passions and finally wear themselves out by excess of liberty.

Hence that abundance of evils which have now for a long time settled upon the world, and which pressingly call upon us to seek for help from Him by whose strength alone they can be driven away. Who can He be but Jesus Christ the Only-begotten Son of God? "For there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv., 12). We must have recourse to Him who is the Way, the Truth and the Life. We have gone astray and we must return to the right path: darkness

has overshadowed our minds, and the gloom must be dispelled by the light of truth: death has seized upon us, and we must lay hold of life. It will at length be possible that our many wounds be healed and all justice spring forth again with the hope of restored authority; that the splendors of peace be renewed, and swords and arms drop from the hand when all men shall acknowledge the empire of Christ and willingly obey His word, and "Every tongue shall confess that our Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory of God the Father" (Philippians ii., 11).

When the Church, in the days immediately succeeding her institution, was oppressed beneath the yoke of the Cæsars, a young Emperor saw in the heavens a cross, which became at once the happy omen and cause of the glorious victory that soon followed. And now, to-day, behold another blessed and heavenly token is offered to our sight—the most Sacred Heart of Jesus, with a cross rising from it and shining forth with dazzling splendor amidst flames of love. In that Sacred Heart all our hopes should be placed, and from it the salvation of men is to be confidently besought.

Finally, there is one motive which We are unwilling to pass over in silence, personal to Ourselves it is true, but still good and weighty, which moves Us to undertake this celebration. God, the author of every good, not long ago preserved Our life by curing Us of a dangerous disease. We now wish, by this increase of the honor paid to the Sacred Heart, that the memory of this great mercy should be brought prominently forward, and Our gratitude be publicly acknowledged.

For these reasons, we ordain that on the ninth, tenth and eleventh of the coming month of June, in the principal church of every town and village, certain appointed prayers be said, and on each of these days there be added to the other prayers the Litany of the Sacred Heart approved by Our authority. On the last day the form of consecration shall be recited which, Venerable Brethren, We sent to you with these letters.

As a pledge of divine benefits, and in token of Our paternal benevolence, to you, and to the clergy and people committed to your care We lovingly grant in the Lord the Apostolic Benediction.

Given in Rome at St. Peter's on the 25th day of May, 1899, the twenty-second year of Our Pontificate.

LEO XIII.

## INDICTIO UNIVERSALIS IUBILAEI ANNI SANCTI MILLESIMI NONINGENTESIMI. LEO EPISCOPUS, SERVUS SERVORUM DEI.

*Universis Christifidelibus Praesentes Litteras Inspecturis Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.*

PROPERANTE ad exitum saeculo, quod annuente Deo Nos ipsi prope totum emensi vivendo sumus, animum volentes induximus rem ex instituto maiorum decernere, quae saluti populo christiano sit, ac simul curarum Nostrarum, qualescumque in gerendo Pontificatu maximo fuerint, extremum velut vestigium ostendat. IUBILAEUM MAGNUM dicimus, iam inde antiquitus in christianos mores inductum, decessorumque Nostrorum providentia sancitum: quem tradita a patribus consuetudo *Annum sanctum* appellat, tum quod solet esse caeremoniis sanctissimis comitatior, tum maxime quod castigandis moribus renovandisque ad sanctitatem animis adiumenta uberiora suppeditat. Testes ipsi sumus quanto opere is ad salutem valuit qui postremo actus est ritu solemni, Nobis videlicet adolescentibus, Leone XII pontifice maximo: quo tempore magnum tutissimumque religioni publicae theatrum Roma praebuit. Memoria tenemus ac videre propemodum etiam nunc videmur peregrinorum frequentiam: circumeuntem templa augustissma, disposito agmine, multitudinem: viros apostolicos concionantes in publico: celeberrima Urbis loca divinis laudibus personantia: pietatis caritatisque exempla edentem in oculis omnium, magno Cardinalium comitatu, pontificem. Cuius recordatione memoriae ex temporibus iis ad ea, quae nunc sunt, mens acerbius revocatur. Earum quippe rerum quas diximus, quaeque si in luce civitatis, nulla re impediente, peragantur, mire alere atque incitare pietatem popularem solent, nunc quidem, mutato Urbis statu, aut nulla facultas est, aut in alieno posita arbitrio.

Utcumque sit, fore confidimus ut salubrium consiliorum adiutor Deus voluntati huic Nostrae, quam in eius gratiam gloriamque suscepimus, cursum prosperum ac sine offensione largiatur. Quo enim spectamus, aut quid volumus? Hoc nempe unice, efficere homines, quanto plures nitendo possumus, salutis aeternae compotes, huiusque rei gratiâ morbis animorum ea ipsa, quae Iesus Christus in potestate Nostra esse voluit, adhibere remedia. Atque id a Nobis non modo munus apostolicum, sed ipsa ratio temporis plane videtur postulare. Non quod recte factorum laudumque

christianarum sit sterile saeculum: quin imo abundant, adiuvante Deo, exempla optima, nec virtutum genus est ullum tam excelsum tamque arduum, in quo non excellere magnum numerum videamus: vim namque procreandi alendique virtutes habet christiana religio divinitus insitam, eamque inexhaustam ac perpetuam. Verum si circumspiciendo quis intuetur in partem alteram, quae tenebrae, quantus error, quam ingens multitudo in interitum ruentium sempiternum! Angimur praecipuo quodam dolore, quotiescumque venit in mentem quanta pars christianorum, sentiendi cogitandique licentia deliniti, malarum doctrinarum veneno sitienter hausto, fidei divinae in se ipsi grande munus quotidie corrumpant. Hinc christianae taedium vitae, et late fusa morum labes: hinc illa rerum, quae sensibus percipiantur, acerrima atque inexplebilis, appetentia, curaeque et cogitationes omnes aversae a Deo, humi defixae. Ex quo fonte teterrimo dici vix potest quanta iam in ea ipsa, quae sunt civitatum fundamenta, pernicies influxit. Nam contumaces vulgo spiritus, motus turbidi popularium cupiditatum, caeca pericula, tragica scelera, nihil denique sunt aliud, si libet caussam introspicere, nisi quaedam de adipiscendis fruendisque rebus mortalibus atque effrenata decertatio.

Ergo interest privatim et publice, admoneri homines officii sui, excitari consopita veterno pectora, atque ad studium salutis revocari quotquot in singulas prope horas discrimen temere adeunt pereundi, perdendique per socordiam aut superbiam caelestia atque immutabilia bona, ad quae sola nati sumus. Atqui huc omnino pertinet annus sacer: etenim per id tempus totum Ecclesia parens, non nisi lenitatis et misericordiae memor, omni qua potest ope studioque contendit ut in melius humana consilia referantur, et quod quisque deliquit, luat emendatrix vitae poenitentia. Hoc illa proposito, multiplicata obsecratione auctâque instantia, placare nititur violatum Dei numen, arcessere e caelo munerum divinorum copiam: lateque reclusis gratiae theseauris, qui sibi sunt ad dispensandum commissi, vocat ad spem veniae universitatem christianorum, tota in eo ut reluctantes etiam voluntates abundantia quadam amoris indulgentiaeque pervincat. Quibus ex rebus quid ni expectemus fructus uberes, si Deo placet, ac tempori accommodatos?

Augent opportunitatem rei extraordinaria quaedam solemnia de quibus iam, opinamur, satis notitia percrebuit; quae quidem sollemnia excessum undevicesimi saeculi vicesimique ortum quodam modo consecraverint. Intelligi de honoribus volumus Iesu Christo Servatori medio eo tempore ubique terrarum habendis. Hac de re excogitatum privatorum pietate consilium laudavimus libentes ac probavimus: quid enim fieri sanctius aut salutarius queat? Quae

genus humanum appetat, quae diligat, quae speret, ad quae tendat, in unigenito Dei Filio sunt omnia: is enim est *salus, vita, resurrectio nostra:* quem velle deserere, est velle funditus interire. Quamobrem etsi numquam silet, imo perpetua viget omnibus locis ea, quae Domino nostro Iesu Christo debetur, adoratio, laus, honos, gratiarum actio, tamen nullae gratiae nullique honores possunt esse tanti, quin longe plures ei debeantur longeque maiores. Praeterea num paucos saeculum tulit immemori ingratoque animo, qui divino servatori suo pro pietate contemptum, pro beneficiis iniurias referre consueverint? Certe ipsa ab eius legibus praeceptisque vita discrepans plurimorum argumento est flagitiosae ingratissimaeque voluntatis. Quid quod de ipsa Iesu divinitate Arianum scelus non semel renovatum nostra vidit aetas? Macti itaque animo, quotquot populari incitamentum pietati consilio isto novo pulcherrimoque praebuistis; quod tamen ita efficere oportet, nihil ut Iubilaei curriculum, nihil statuta solemnia impediat. In proxima ista catholicorum hominum significatione religionis ac fidei id quoque propositum inerit, detestari quaecumque impie dicta patratave memoriâ nostrâ sint, deque iniuriis, augustissimo Iesu Christi numini praesertim publice illatis, publice satisfacere. Nunc autem, si vera quaerimus, genus satisfactionis maxime optabile et solidum et expressum et inustum notis veritatis illud omnino est, deliquisse poenitere, et pace a Deo veniaque implorata, virtutum officia aut impensius colere aut intermissa repetere. Cui quidem rei cum tantas habeat annus sacer opportunitates, quantas initio attigimus, rursus apparet oportere atque opus esse ut populus christianus accingat se plenus animi ac spei.

Quapropter sublatis in caelum oculis, divitem in misericordia Deum enixe adprecati, ut votis inceptisque Nostris benigne annuere, ac virtute sua illustrare hominum mentes itemque permovere animos pro bonitate sua velit; romanorum Pontificum decessorum Nostrorum vestigia sequuti, de venerabilium fratrum Nostrorum S. R. E. Cardinalium assensu, universale maximumque Iubilaeum in hac sacra Urbe a prima vespera Natalis Domini anno millesimo octingentesimo nonagesimo nono incohandum, et ad primam vesperam Natalis Domini anno millesimo noningentesimo finiendum, auctoritate omnipotentis Dei, beatorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli ac Nostra, quod gloriae divinae, animarum saluti, Ecclesiae incremento bene vertat, indicimus per has litteras et promulgamus, ac pro indicto promulgatoque haberi volumus.

Quo quidem Iubilaei anno durante, omnibus utriusque sexus Christifidelibus vere poenitentibus et confessis sacraque Communione refectis, qui beatorum Petri et Pauli, item Sancti Ioannis

Lateranensis et Sanctae Mariae Maioris de Urbe Basilicas semel saltem in die per viginti continuos aut interpolatos dies sive naturales sive ecclesiasticos, nimirum a primis vesperis unius diei ad integrum subsequentis diei vespertinum crepusculum computandos, si Romae degant cives aut incolae: si vero peregre venerint, per decem saltem eiusmodi dies, devote visitaverint, et pro Ecclesiae exaltatione, haeresum extirpatione, catholicorum Principum concordia, et christiana populi salute pias ad Deum preces effuderint, plenissimam peccatorum suorum indulgentiam, remissionem et veniam misericorditer in Domino concedimus et impertimus.

Quoniamque potest usuvenire nonnullis ut ea, quae supra praescripta sunt, exequi, etsi maxime velint, tamen aut nullo modo aut tantummodo ex parte queant, morbo scilicet aliaque caussa legitima in Urbe aut ipso in itinere prohibiti; idcirco Nos piae eorum voluntati, quantum in Domino possumus, tribuimus ut vere poenitentes et confessione rite abluti et sacra communione refecti, indulgentiae et remissionis supra dictae participes perinde fiant, ac si Basilicas, quas memoravimus, diebus per Nos definitis reipsa visitassent.

Quotquot igitur ubique estis, dilecti filii, quibus commodum est adesse, ad sinum Roma suum vos amanter invitat. Sed tempore sacro decet catholicum hominem, si consentaneus sibi esse velit, non aliter versari Romae, nisi fide christiana comite. Propterea posthabere nominatum oportet leviorum profanarumve rerum intempestiva spectacula, ad ea converso potius animo quae religionem pietatemque suadeant. Suadet autem imprimis, si alte consideretur, nativum ingenium Urbis, atque eius impressa divinitus effigies, nullo mortalium consilio, nulla vi mutabilis. Unam enim ex omnibus romanam urbem ad munera excelsiora atque altiora humanis delegit, sibique sacravit servator humani generis Iesus Christus. Hic domicilium imperii sui non sine diuturna atque arcana praeparatione constituit: hic sedem Vicarii sui stare iussit in perpetuitate temporum: hic caelestis doctrinae lumen sancte inviolateque custodiri, atque hinc tamquam a capite augustissimoque fonte in omnes late terras propagari voluit, ita quidem ut a Christo ipso dissentiat quicumque a fide romana dissenserit. Augent sanctitudinem avita religionis monumenta, singularis templorum maiestas, principum Apostolorum sepulchra, hypogea martyrum fortissimorum. Quarum rerum omnium qui probe sciat excipere voces, sentiet profecto non tam peregrinari se in civitate aliena, quam versari in sua, ac melior, adiuvante Deo, discessurus est quam venerit.

Ut autem praesentes Litterae ad omnium fidelium notitiam facilius perveniant, volumus earum exemplis etiam impressis, manu tamen alicuius notarii publici subscriptis ac sigillo personae in

ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae munitis, eamdem prorsus adhiberi fidem, quae ipsis praesentibus haberetur, si forent exhibitae vel ostensae. Nulli ergo hominum liceat hanc paginam Nostrae indictionis, promulgationis, concessionis et voluntatis infringere, vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc attentare praesumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei, ac beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum eius se noverit incursurum.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum anno Incarnationis Dominicae millesimo octingentesimo nonagesimo nono, Quinto Idus Maii, Pontificatus Nostri anno vicesimo secundo.

C. *Card.* Aloisi Masella, *Pro-Dat.*

A. *Card.* Macchi.

*Visa de Curia:* I. de Aquila e Vicecomitibus. L. † P.
*Reg. in Secret. Brevium:* I. Cugnonius.

Anno a Nativitate Domini Millesimo octingentesimo nonagesimo nono, die undecimo Maii, festo Ascensionis Domini nostri Iesu Christi, Pontificatus Sanctissimi in Christo Patris et Domini nostri Leonis divina providentia Papae XIII anno vicesimo secundo, praesentes litteras apostolicas in atrio sacrosanctae Basilicae Vaticanae de Urbe, adstante populo, legi et solemniter publicavi.'

Ego Ioseph De Aquila e Vicecomitibus,

*Abbreviator de Curia.*

## PROCLAMATION OF THE UNIVERSAL JUBILEE OF THE HOLY YEAR NINETEEN HUNDRED. LEO, BISHOP, SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD.

*To all the Faithful of Christ who shall read these Letters, Health and Apostolic Benediction.*

THE century, which, by the grace of God, we have ourselves seen almost from its commencement, draws rapidly to its close. Willingly have we followed the institutions of our predecessors in so ordering things that they may redound to the good of all Christian peoples, and which may be perhaps for them the last proof of our care in the government of the Sovereign Pontificate. We speak of the Great Jubilee introduced in ancient times among Christian customs and observed by our predecessors, who bestowed upon the years of general jubilee the title of the Holy Year, because it was usual for such a year to be blessed by a greater number of holy ceremonies, as these furnish the most copious means of help for the correction of morals and the leading of souls to sanctity.

We have ourselves seen with our own eyes the fruitful result of the last solemn celebration of the Holy Year. It was in the Pontificate of Leo XII, and we were as yet in the years of our youth. It was truly a grand sight to see then the manifestations of religious fervor in Rome. We can remember as if the scene were still before our eyes, the immense concourse of pilgrims, the multitudes which flocked processionally to one or other of the great basilicas, the sacred orators who preached in the public streets, and the most frequented quarters of the city resounding with the Divine praises. The Sovereign Pontiff himself, with a numerous suite of Cardinals and in the sight of all the people, gave a noble example of piety and charity.

From such thoughts as these we turn with renewed sorrow to the times in which we now live; for such practices of piety, when without hindrance they were fulfilled under the eyes of all the citizens, augmented admirably the fervor and piety of the whole people; but now, on account of the changed condition of Rome, it is impossible to renew them, for in order to do so in any measure we must depend upon the arbitration of others. But however that may be, God, who ever blesses salutary counsels, will concede—such is our hope—success to this our design, undertaken solely for Him and for His glory. At what do we aim or what do we wish?

Nothing else truly than to render more easy the way of eternal salvation to the souls confided to us, and for this end to administer to the infirm of spirit those remedies which it has pleased our Lord Jesus Christ to place in our hands. This administration seems to us not alone a duty of our apostolic office, but a duty which is peculiarly necessary to our times. The present age, however, cannot be said to be sterile, either in regard to good works or to Christian virtues. Thanks be to God, we have examples of both in abundance, nor is there any virtue, however lofty and arduous its attainment and practice, in which many are not found to signalize themselves, because it is a power proper to the Christian religion, Divinely founded, inexhaustible and perpetual, to generate and nourish virtue. Yet, casting our eyes around, we see, on the other hand, with what blindness, with what persistent error, whole peoples are hurrying to eternal ruin. And this thought strikes bitterly to our heart—how many Christians, led away by the license of hearing and of thought, absorbing with avidity the intoxicating errors of false doctrine, go on day by day dissipating and destroying the grand gift of the faith! Hence arise repugnance to Christian living, that insatiable appetite for the things of this world, and hence cares and thoughts alienated from God and rooted in the world. It is almost impossible to express in words the damage which has already accrued from this iniquitous source to the very foundations of society. The minds of men ordinarily rebellious, the blind tendency of popular cupidity, hidden perils, tragical crimes, are nothing more to those who seek their source and cause than the unrestrained strife to possess and enjoy the goods of this world.

It is of supreme importance, therefore, to public no less than private life, to admonish men as to the duties of their state, to arouse souls steeped in forgetfulness of duty, to recall to the thought of their own salvation those who run imminent risk of perishing and of losing through their negligence and pride those celestial and unchangeable rewards for the possession of which we are born. This is the aim of the Holy Year. The Church, mindful only of her intrinsic benignity and mercy as a most tender Mother, studies at this time, with love and by every means within her ample power, to re-conduct souls to better counsels and to promote in each works of expiation by means of penance and emendation of life. To this end, multiplying prayers and augmenting the fervor of the faithful, she seeks to appease the outraged majesty of God and to draw down His copious and celestial gifts. She opens wide the rich treasury of indulgences, of which she is the appointed dispenser, and exhorts the whole of Christianity to the firm hope of pardon. She is purely

intent upon vanquishing with unconquerable love and sweetness the most rebellious wills. How, then, may we not hope to obtain, with God's help, rich fruits and profuse, and such as are most adapted to the present needs?

Several extraordinary solemnities, the notices of which we believe to be already sufficiently diffused, and which will serve in some manner to consecrate the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, greatly increase the advantage of the opportunity now given. We speak of the honors to be rendered at this time in every part of the world to Jesus Christ as our Redeemer. On this account we were profuse in our approbation and praise of a project which had its source in the piety of private individuals, and, in fact, what could be more holy and salutary? All that which man should hope for and desire is contained in the only-begotten Son of God, our Salvation, Life, and Resurrection. To desire to abandon Him is to desire eternal perdition. We could never silence adoration, praise, thanksgiving due to our Lord Jesus Christ, and without intermission they should be repeated everywhere, for in every place no thanksgiving, no honor, can be so great but that it may be increased. Our age produces perhaps many men who are forgetful and ungrateful, who ordinarily respond to the mercy of their Divine Saviour with disdain and to His gifts with offenses and injuries. Certainly the lives of many are so far removed from His laws and His precepts as to argue in themselves ungrateful and malicious souls. And what shall we say to see renewed again in these times and not once alone, the blasphemy of the Arian heresy regarding the Divinity of Jesus Christ.

Courage, then, and to work, all you who with this new and most beautiful proposition seek to excite the piety of the people to new fervor. Do what you can in such manner that you impede not the course of the Jubilee and the appointed solemnities. Let it be added that in the forthcoming manifestations of faith and religion this special intention shall be kept in view—hatred of all that which within our memory has been impiously said or done, especially against the Divine Majesty of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to satisfy publicly for the injuries publicly inflicted upon Him. Now if we are really in earnest, we must know that to repent of evil done, and, having implored peace and pardon of God, to exercise ourselves with great diligence, in the duties necessary to virtue, and to assume those we have cast aside, is the means of satisfaction most desirable and assured, and which bears upon it the impress of truth. Since the Holy Year offers to all the opportunities which we have touched on in the beginning, it is a necessary provision that the Christian

people enter upon it full of courage and of hope. For which reason, raising our eyes to heaven and praying from our heart that God, so rich in mercy, would vouchsafe to concede benignly His blessing and favor to our desires and works, and would illuminate with His Divine light the minds of all men, and move their souls to conform with His holy will and inestimable goodness, We, following in this the example of the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, with the assent of the Cardinals of the Holy Roman College, our Venerable Brethren, in virtue of these letters, with the authority of Christ, of the Blessed Peter and Paul, and with our own authority, order and promulgate from this hour the great and universal jubilee, which will commence in this holy city of Rome at the first Vespers of the Nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ of the year 1899, and which will close at first Vespers of the Nativity of our Lord of the year 1900. May all redound to the glory of God, the salvation of souls, and the good of the Church. During this year of jubilee we concede and impart mercifully in our Lord full indulgence, remission and pardon of sin to all faithful Christians of either sex who, being truly penitent shall confess and communicate, visiting devoutly the Roman basilicas of SS. Peter and Paul, St. John Lateran, and St. Mary Major, at least once a day for twenty days continuously or at intervals; that is, the obligation is to be fulfilled between the first Vespers of each day and the last Vespers of the day following, whether the faithful be Citizens of Rome or not, if they are residing permanently in Rome. If they come to Rome as pilgrims, then they must visit the said basilicas in the same manner for ten days, praying devoutly to God for the exaltation of Holy Church, for the extirpation of heresies, for peace and concord amongst Christian princes, and for the salvation of the whole Christian people.

And since it may happen to many that with all their good-will they cannot or can only in part carry out the above, being either, while in Rome or on their journey, impeded by illness or other legitimate causes, we, taking into account their good-will, can, when they are truly repentant and have duly confessed and communicated, concede to them the participation in the same indulgences and remission of sins as if they had actually visited the basilicas on the days appointed. Rome, therefore, invites you lovingly to her bosom, beloved children, from all parts of the world, who have means of visiting her. Know also that to a good Catholic in this sacred time it is fitting that he come to Rome guided purely by Christian faith, and that he should renounce especially the satisfaction of sight-seeing merely idle or profane, turning his soul rather to those things which predispose him to religion and piety. And

that which tends greatly so to predispose him, if he look within is the natural character of the city, a certain character divinely impressed upon her, and not to be changed by human means, nor by any act of violence. For Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, chose only, amongst all its cities, that of Rome to be the centre of an action more than earthly, consecrating it to Himself. Here He placed, and not without long and careful preparation, the throne of His own empire; here He commanded that the see of His Vicar should be raised to the perpetuity of time; here He willed that the light of revealed truth should be jealously and inviolably guarded, and that from here light should be diffused throughout the whole earth in such a manner that those who are alienated from the faith of Rome are alienated from Christ. The religious monuments raised by our fathers, the singular majesty of her temples, the tomb of the Apostles, the Catacombs of the martyrs, all serve to increase the aspect of holiness and to impress those who visit her in the spirit of faith. Whosoever knows the voice of such monuments feels that he is no pilgrim in a foreign city, but a citizen in his own, and by God's grace he will realize this fact at his going, more forcibly than at his coming.

We wish, in order that these present letters may be brought more easily under the notice of all, that printed copies, signed by a public notary and furnished with the seal of some ecclesiastical dignitary, shall be received with the same faith as would be given to the original by those who have heard or read it.

To no one will it be lawful to alter any word of this our disposition, promulgation, concession, and will, or to rashly oppose it. If any should presume to make any such attempt, let them know that they incur thereby the indignation of God Almighty and of His Apostles Peter and Paul.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, on the 11th of May, in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord 1899, and the 22d of our Pontificate.

C. *Card.* Aloisi-Masella, *Pro-Datory.*

L. *Card.* Macchi.

*Witnessed on behalf of the Curia:* G. Dell' Aquila Visconti.

*Registered in the Secretariate of Briefs,* J. Cugnoni.

In the year of the Nativity of our Lord 1899, on the 11th day of May, feast of the Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the 22d year of the Pontificate of our Holy Father and Lord in Christ, Leo XIII, by Divine Providence Pope, I have read and solemnly promulgated the present apostolical letters in the presence of the people, in the porch of the Holy Patriarchal Vatican Basilica,

Giuseppe Dell' Aquila Visconti,

*Official of the Curia.*

## LAWFUL LIBERTY AND REASONABLE SERVICE.

"Hard Sayings"—A Selection of Meditations and Studies, By George Tyrrell, S. J.

THIS work has two main aspects, the first which it presents to those without, the second to those within the Church. This is not to say that these two points of view can be sharply defined or separated, but that either may be distinguished, and that it has its own special value both for those not yet convinced of the truths it sets forth and for those who believe but need a richer and larger apprehension.

Now, without in any way preferring one of these ends to the other, we are here concerned chiefly with the latter. "Charity begins at home;" and perhaps the charity that, conforming to this rule, commences in the household, does finally the most for those also who are without; for the loveliness of the tabernacles and the evident blessedness of those who dwell in the courts of the Lord are the best inducement to enter. A life which is represented as a slavery may indeed be accepted by men under the stress of dire hunger and necessity, but a "reasonable service" can offer advantages to those who have not sunk to this lowest grade of destitution. The principles of this book, properly apprehended, will do much to establish, in the household of the faith, that "happy liberty of the children of God" so dear to the hearts of our wisest teachers and ascetics; and it cannot do this without, at the same time, removing many stumbling blocks from the path of those who do not believe, and convincing them that faith is not a thraldom, and that what seem like obstacles are often misapprehensions.

The title, as the author tells us in the introduction, is drawn from that Gospel scene "when many of the disciples of Jesus turned back and walked with Him no more, because of His doctrine concerning the great Mystery of Divine Love, in which all the other mysteries of the Catholic Faith are gathered up."[1] This very name will give us some promise of the manner in which the various subjects are treated. The "sayings" are "hard" and therefore it has been the endeavour of the writer to render them easier to understand, and, still more, easier to love. There are many to whom the entire drift of the work will be imperceptible, who will yet gain in breadth and freedom from the thoughts it presents. The various truths it treats are discussed from within and not from without; from within, that

[1] P. XVIII.

is to say, not only as regards the doctrine under consideration, but also as regards the mind which is considering it.

Some reviews have praised this book chiefly as containing a kind of "up to date" asceticism. That a breath of the "Zeitgeist" blows through it is undeniable, for it is to the mind of to-day that it is addressed, it is the difficulties of our present age that are chiefly held in view. The "sayings" which are hardest to us are not necessarily the ones that were hardest to those that went before, or that will be hardest to those that follow. But mere modernity would be but a slight merit in a work which deals with eternal truths; a certain universality of time and place is an essential quality of true ascetic and spiritual teaching. Indeed it seems to us that there is much of the thought in this volume which breathes a spirit more of the past than of the present; and that it reminds us rather of the days when men wandered into woods and deserts to think, than of those now fleeting in which they hurry into towns to speak and write. In the words of the author himself:

"There is so much to be known nowadays if we would pass muster as people of even ordinary education, so much of the experiences and thoughts of other men to be stored away in our memories, that life in most cases is not long enough for the process, and no margin of leisure remains for digesting and assimilating the food with which we have been surfeited."[2]

When the body is suffering from one of those mysterious, wasting diseases, against which medicine is so powerless, the physician sometimes recommends as a last resource, a return to the native land. Mountains, woods and sea have all been tried and failed; perhaps the homely scenes in which the poor sufferer was born, the air which he first breathed into his feeble lungs, may help him more than all the rest; and if his life is not thereby prolonged he may at any rate, die in greater peace.

In somewhat the same way our tired race has at times to be brought back to the atmosphere in which it was born. It has wandered through many strange lands of thought, and looked at truth from a hundred different points of view. All at once it feels that its strength is failing, that too wide a stretch has weakened its grasp, too many objects have dazzled its sight; it turns towards home, and, taking up the lessons of its childhood, the truths on which its forefathers lived, finds in them a wealth it had never before suspected.

In this way the work before us brings back thoughts more habitual to the cloistered life of earlier ages than to the bustling present;

[2] "The Higher Life," p. 25.

but they come before us with a fulness of fresh life, because the very variety of our experiences has fitted us to understand them better and appreciate them more. We look on them no longer with the unclouded eye of childhood, but with a vision purified by life and suffering.

If we ask ourselves why we wearied of many of these old truths as they were first presented to us, the answer is that not having had to seek them for ourselves we never attempted to fathom them, but accepted them as a kind of spiritual luggage which had to be borne on our backs, but not made part of ourselves. Certainly, as Catholics, we did not need to discover the doctrines which were authoritatively taught us; but we did need, according to the diversity of our temperaments, to *think* out, and to *work* out the truths on which we were to live. Not having done so, the result has been, in some cases such as the author indicates, when speaking of the loss of faith in certain souls:

"So we find many whose religion consists of a few platitudes remembered from childhood, seeds still lying by the wayside, which have never struck root so as to become a living growth, developing *pari passu* with the growth of the soul. Human respect may seal their lips, but in their hearts they wonder what others can find in religion, and why they speak of it as a necessity of life. Such minds are an easy prey to the shallow sophist, who has no difficulty in persuading them of the untenableness of their religious notions; nor is it with much of a wrench that they part with the faith which they have never understood, and never loved."[3]

There is much to be said for and against the principle of inheritance. It is certainly good to begin life with a start due to the labour of others, but only provided we walk forward on our own legs afterwards. If we choose to live on the labours of past generations, without making fresh capital of our own, our birthright becomes a simple disaster. And thus it sometimes happens that the only way to make men out of an effete race is to turn them into the backwoods, and force them to begin life again at the point from which their ancestors started. Let them learn, like savages, to count on their own fingers, to do their sums, however limited, with their own brains, instead of turning to a ready reckoner and accomplishing difficult calculations without any effort.

The founder of a great religious order once seriously hesitated as to whether or not he should provide his children with written rules. He feared lest the letter should injure the spirit, and lest

---

[3] "Presence of God," p. 33.

the living bond should be sacrificed to what might become a dead one. Why should he devise means of fastening together those who were already united in heart and soul for the prosecution of one absorbing end? And if at last he complied with the more general usage, he was looking rather to the dangers of the future than to the needs of the present. Periods of intense life have not been times of very minute regulation. A body abounding in health and vigour has not much need of hygienic prescriptions, which are required rather to check the morbid tendencies of incipient disease, which seeks to nourish itself at the cost of nature. Living forces have their own natural living organs, and do not need the creation of artificial channels in which to expend themselves. Nevertheless the nature of the world in which we live obliges us sometimes to turn rivers into channels; the process of adaptation is inevitable in a society of mixed motive and action. But our period of loss begins when we pass from organization to artificiality, and turn our spiritual system into a kind of glorified machine. Then the very additional facilities we possess become our ruin rather than our gain, and our inheritance becomes in the spiritual order, what it has too often proved in the temporal one, a real misfortune. Then when the evil has become apparent, the reformers sally forth, but few, alas! are those who seek to infuse new life into the exhausted system, countless those who simply set themselves to demolish what they consider worn out and antiquated. It is rare to find any who know how to question in an age that questions, but also to preserve in an age that destroys.

"Cui Bono" is a question that has come from two opposite camps, directed by each side against the out-works of its antagonist. Recent ascetics have asked the question of nature and of art; with pure motives but excessive zeal, they have pruned, uprooted, felled, all that had no immediate and evident relation to the end in view. They have organized, re-organized, and simplified the path of perfection till there was little fear of doing actually wrong, but not enough space to do entirely right; faults have been avoided, but virtue has lost something of its native strength and heroism.

A sudden sense of this deficiency has arisen; some new measures were needed, some useless rigour must be abated, some unnecessary restrictions removed. But once again, from this new quarter, the fatal cry has been heard. "Cui Bono?" away with old world institutions! The mechanism of the past is used up and done for! Let the world be made new in spirituality as in politics!

Armed with axe and hatchet the new prophets come forth on their mission of reform and enlightenment; they undermine and batter

one outpost after another, finding that the destruction of each one involves the demolition of another also which depends on it. Having started they cannot stop, but must hack and burn to the bitter end; and then perhaps they stand stricken with remorse, and gaze sadly on their own handiwork. The old building is gone, the one they had planned is not yet ready and, meanwhile, many who had found in the first edifice all they needed, who had not suffered, as their would-be deliverers, from any sense of rigour or confinement, are standing by the charred and ruined walls, houseless and shivering.

"For my meat," said St. Paul, "shall the weak brother perish for whom Christ died?" Because I know my right and title to a larger liberty shall I force my own customs on those who do not need them? Because the clothes do not fit me shall I prevent others from wearing them who find perfect ease and comfort therein? Freedom is a condition, relative to the needs of each one, not an unchanging quantity or state. None can be said to suffer from oppression who can develop heart and mind in the sphere in which they find themselves. Our institutions are, after all, but of ephemeral value, the largest as well as the narrowest. The question to be asked in each age is not so much as to the value of a special government or organization in itself, but as to the liberty and peace which individuals find in it. If their lives run easily and naturally in the prepared channel, it cannot be said that the banks are too narrow.

But here an objection will arise which must not be overlooked. In the days of emancipation certain opponents of the movement urged that the slaves had all they needed, food, clothing and shelter; that they were contented with their lot and ought not to be disturbed in it. The advocates of freedom answered, on the other hand, that such content was, in itself, a reproach and degradation; that men *ought not* to be satisfied in a state of slavery, and that it was a good work even to make them discontented. The same is the avowed object of many social reformers at the present day, who openly endeavour to foster a certain spirit of restlessness and criticism in those whom they seek to benefit. Thus may it not also be said that it is good to arrest any kind of mistaken spiritual repression, even if the process involve a stage of temporary suffering and privation?

It is here, in the practical solution of this problem, that we need, more than anywhere, that silent, over-ruling respect for the individual which is advocated on all sides and exercised on few. When shall we learn, in things that concern the mind and heart,

that it is as tyrannical to shout in a man's ears when he does not want to hear, as forcibly to prevent him from listening when he would? That we can sin against a man's liberty as much in stripping him of what he likes to wear as in covering him with wraps he finds heavy and oppressive?

There are times when a neighbour may be deprived mentally as well as physically, of all power of self-help; when just as firemen have to partially stun frightened women, so as to overcome their resistance, and bear them away from a burning house, so must we act with those who have become momentarily helpless for their own good. But let us in such cases, never forget that we are acting as we should not normally act with our equals and peers; we are treating them provisionally as things inferior and subject to us; and our duty is to do all on our part to hasten the moment when they can regain their legitimate freedom, and stand with us once more on a footing of perfect equality.

The more we reflect on these truths the more clearly we shall see that it is in great part for the very protection of this personal liberty that authority exists. Anarchy, in the civil order, is a condition of things in which no man can be secure of his individual rights; in religion it means an intrusion of the public into our most private and sacred affairs. One great mission of the Church is to guard against this. Speaking of her office in this respect, and contrasting her discipline with the undefined powers granted to the Nonconformist minister, the writer says:

"Indeed he" (the Nonconformist) "tolerates far more than any Catholic would endure; for he leaves it to the mood and caprice of his pastor to determine on each occasion the substance of the public prayers, so that those present are willing to be represented before God as sad or joyful, as penitential or triumphant, as needing these graces rather than others, all according to the passing phases of the minister's own soul, and are ready to say Amen to whatever may come into his head. Also they are willing to listen patiently to his private interpretation of the word of God, and to accept it unless it manifestly disagrees with their own; they to a large extent trust him, and allow their minds to be formed by him in doctrinal and religious questions. In a word, he is not merely their delegate before God, but their representative; his mediation is not passive, as his who repeats by rote the words entrusted to him by another; but rather active as of one to whom we commit our will and judgment. The Catholic priest, on the other hand, is but the Church's delegate. Every word that he utters at the altar, nay every little gesture and intonation, is prescribed for him by the Christian re-

public not merely of to-day, but of the ages past; and even though the setting be his own yet the doctrine that he sets forth in the pulpit is not his own, but that of the Church who has sent him, whose mouthpiece he is. Were he a reprobate or an unbeliever, he might be guilty of sacrilege in preaching and praying, but not of insincerity or hypocrisy, since he is understood to speak not in his own name, but the Church's. The very vestments in which he blots out his personality when he approaches the altar, are an indication of her desire that in his official work he should put off himself and should put on the Church. We do not for a moment deny that the individual will break through and assert himself in spite of all precautions; that he, and still more his followers and admirers, will often put the man before the priest. But wherever this tendency prevails, whether in the popular preacher or the popular confessor; in the ministry of the word or in that of the sacraments; whether by the intrusion of merely personal views and opinions into priestly teaching and direction or by the substitution of personal tasks and fancies in place of the established liturgical observances of the Church, it is always felt to be uncatholic, an alien element hostile to that liberty from individual tyranny which the Church secures for her children."[4]

We who belong to the Catholic Church no more consider Her authority to involve a repression of our personal liberty than we should regard the law of gravity as an obstacle to movement and freedom. Our bodies rest on the earth in virtue of their own natural constitution; our minds conform to what we regard as infallible teaching in virtue of the law of our own conscience. In so far as the Church teaches certain and clearly defined truths, She appeals to the inward laws of our own spiritual constitution, and it is in their name that She exacts faith and obedience. But in other matters where, by reason of Her universality, She allows a variety of means and methods, it is one of Her most sacred tasks to guard Her children from the least invasion of personal tyranny and, while allowing that free play and initiative which it is Her joy to encourage, to prevent their degenerating into undue private influence.

And here it is that the supposed partizans of liberty may sometimes as much deserve Her reprimands as those they seek to depose, for, in their desire to repress repression, they sometimes engender it. True spiritual despotism is forcing a soul along a path which is not its own, and it begets an unrighteous dependence, because, in so far as a man is on a road where he cannot see, he is

[4] "The Mystical Body," pp. 403-405.

forced to trust to the guidance of another; whereas if he walks where the light falls he needs no strange hand. Now this is the case when we, to use contradictory terms, compulsorily liberate anyone from what we regard as unjust servitude. Whereas they formerly knew their way, and went along it in ease and freedom, they now find themselves in strange lands, and are entirely dependent on foreign guidance. Had they brought themselves thither the light would have broken gradually, adapting itself to their own vision; but now they are blinded, and with each stumble grow more pitifully helpless.

Let us then open our minds to the fact that it is not only the opinion of one side or another, but the firm conviction of all, that freedom is one of our greatest and most essential goods, and, from a spiritual point of view, the inalienable right of every immortal soul. But let us then proceed to recognize also that this liberty is a thing inborn, fundamental, and most intimate to our personal being, and not so dependent on external conditions as some of our modern reformers would make it.

If we seek a parallel in things civil and political the same truth is equally apparent, though not always admitted. Freedom is, in fact, the ultimate goal, to which all forms of government are directed, and the preference in different minds for this or that kind of authority is based on the conscious or instinctive belief that it furnishes the largest measure of personal security or independence, the former being a condition of the latter. Some may be inspired also by a hidden love of power, by a desire not only to think and act as they themselves would, but to make others think and act in the same manner, but this impulse is not so fundamental and universal as the former. Some lean to a democracy, because they think to find the fewest impediments to individual liberty in a condition where all are reckoned to start on an equality and no external advantage or priority is conceded; others prefer monarchical or privileged forms of government because they think that thereby the tyranny of mere numbers is more effectually checked, and the rights of each one more carefully guarded. The conflict of interests will often make us differ as to the practical solution of the question, we may even err as to our own chief good, but we are, at bottom, all seeking the same thing.

How much more is this true with regard to that inward liberty of soul and mind compared with which mere civil freedom is but a bauble. "Do nothing against thy will," this maxim of a philosopher who, of all others, inculcated most the doctrine of moderation and self-control, has inspired the intellectual as well as the

spiritual struggles of all mankind. Those struggles have often been foolish, and wrong in their beginnings, unhappy in their results; the rebel has been led astray by his confusion of government with tyranny, of guidance with coercion. He has cast out one devil, or what he thought to be a devil, and let in seven others worse than the first. He has thought himself the victim of outside despotism, whereas he was really suffering from internal anarchy. But, none the less is the instinct, in itself fundamentally a just one, almost identical with that of self-preservation. It is the legitimate struggle of the soul to preserve its own virginity; to protect itself from all but its lawful master.

Who, however, can read the history of the past without seeing that the efforts for the attainment or conservation of liberty have often led to a directly contrary issue? and who can look out, on the political world of our day without acknowledging that there is a tyranny of the many as well as the few, and that the ballot is not a perfect guarantee of freedom? In like manner the soul can be invaded by the undisciplined forces of the multitude at the moment when she thinks herself freest from the yoke of external authority. In a remarkable, but not sufficiently noticed work, of one of our great writers,[5] there is described the strange and sad experiences of an unwilling "clairvoyant." Endowed with a faculty which enables him to perceive the thoughts and emotions of all around, the privacy of his own soul is destroyed, and his mind is continually flooded with the ideas of other men; he is the unwilling host of innumerable unwelcome guests; like the boy in Andersen's tale, he thrusts his fingers, metaphorically speaking, into his ears, but cannot exclude the thronging perceptions. He is the victim of a knowledge which is merely burdensome—the dullest and most trivial thoughts of others have a free entry to his very soul.

This intrusion of the outer on the inner world is a danger in days of political or spiritual democracy. We think ourselves safe because we may speak as we like; we forget that others may do the same and that, if they make noise enough, we cannot avoid hearing. There is no one to check our expansion, but neither is there anyone to guard our privacy; and of what use is it that the sun shines for all if someone thrusts a glaring paraffin lamp before my eyes, and prevents me from seeing it?

It comes then to this—the rebel, whether civil or religious, is *always* right in resisting compulsion, but is often wrong in his estimate of what compulsion really is.

"It is in thy power," says Marcus Aurelius, "to do nothing against

[5] "Lifted Veil," George Eliot.

thine own proper god and inward spirit. For it is not in any man's power to constrain thee to transgress against him." True, but we sometimes yield to our own weakness or to the importunity of others, and admit the stranger, not indeed to the very centre of the fortress, for it is not in our power to do so, but to the surrounding outworks. No human hand can violate that inward "Temple and Sacrarie" which is of its nature absolutely exclusive of everyone but its Maker, but there is undoubtedly at times too much clamour and disturbance in the outer courts, the avenues of which should be, like Cathedral cloisters, the still approaches to the sanctuary of sanctuaries, but are choked with noisy intruders, who trouble the stillness if they cannot destroy the solitude.

The principle of personal independence is based then on the presence of God in the soul, speaking by the voice of conscience, and if thus understood cannot be exaggerated. Many would find a great part of their difficulties in the matter of faith and obedience fall to the ground if they could but once thoroughly grasp this fact. There is often a hidden and instinctive dread of compulsion which, unknown to us, lies at the root of our intellectual and spiritual sufferings. There are two ways of avoiding this compulsion, the way of resistance and the way of submission. We can walk so as not to be dragged, or we can free ourselves entirely from the arms that encircle us. It is not by the pressure of outside force, but through obedience to the inward dictates of our own conscience that we are to adopt the one or the other.

But this we do not realize. We dread being forced to hold opinions of which we are not convinced, to do things not really commanded. And, bewildered by our own sufferings, we carry out the struggle on the external domain, and try, as it were to drag our soul from its own home, and force it to live on a strange soil. If we reversed the process, if we carried the suit at once into that inner court where all causes must at last be pleaded, he battle would soon be over. It is in that hall of conscience, that seat of the particular judgment, that the dispute must finally be terminated; it is there alone we can hope to hear the everlasting "Yea" and "Nay"; and it is by the word of that inward voice we stand or fall. Not according to the judgment of others shall we be judged, not because they spoke and we did not believe; but in this alone will be our condemnation that, hearing the inward word, "their teaching is true—their commands are just," we neither believed nor obeyed.

In the chapter on "God in Conscience" much of this is indicated. "It is much to be regretted," we read at the opening of the chapter, "that the word conscience or *dictate of conscience*, has come

to be used indiscriminately for two very distinct acts or utterances of the mind—for the moral judgment which indicates to us what is right or wrong in human conduct; and for the command which bids us follow that indication. In either sense conscience may be called the voice of God, though more properly in the latter." And again: "Let us then carefully distinguish conscience as the sense of what is right from conscience as the sense of obligation or of a pressure exerted upon our will. In the former case God speaks to us indirectly, and often fallibly through our reason, and tells us 'That is right, that is wrong.' In the latter God reveals to us infallibly *His own will* and says 'Do what you believe to be right, do not what you believe to be wrong;' and by this revelation our will is brought into immediate contact with His, whether to yield to its pressure or to resist it. Who does not know, from human intercourse, the difference between a mere communication and exchange of ideas in conversation, and the far closer shock of soul with soul when anger or love is excited and will meets with will in conflict or embrace? It is as bringing us into will relations with God that conscience differs so generically from any other act of our mind."[6]

And thus we see that, independent of all choice on our own part, conscience is and must be the final tribunal—that we have not to force ourselves to say "this is true though I see it to be false—this is right, though to me it is plainly wrong," but to fall on our knees in that inmost sanctuary and cry out "Lord, what *Thou* teachest, that will I believe; what *Thou* commandest that will I do."

Words have been uttered here and there of late as though the opinion prevailed that both civil and spiritual liberty are a product of the present age. To say this, certainly as regards the spiritual element, would be to lower it, and make it far less fundamental than it really is. It is, in fact, as old as conscience itself. But just as there exists a political party which would force the public law into private affairs, and thrust the inquisitorial eye of municipal authority into the recess of home life, so has there also been a certain school of asceticism which would regulate the diverse and varying needs of the individual according to an iron law of common convenience and would crush personal energy rather than liberate the slightest divergence from the beaten track. "Travel in this manner," they would say, "and you are at any rate safe," and it is true that certain inconveniences are avoided, but who shall reckon the waste of powers and gifts which might have wrought great results had they been guided, and not merely restrained. The

[6] "God in Conscience," pp. 45-52.

mechanism of the spiritual life is, in such hands, complete and faultless, but let us remember that machines are not organs of invention or progress, but simply of application: they fix our knowledge, but do not advance it.

The work now before us should do much to counteract any narrowing tendency. We have to justify what exists, for ascetic doctrines can never be mere changing fashions, and yet at the same time they may need new life and ampler boundaries. It is easy to demolish, it is not easy to repair and beautify, yet this is often the nobler work.

And so, if perhaps there may have been in the teaching of some modern ascetic writers too much of the instinct of repression; too much acceptance (in the words of a holy and gifted woman) of the *unnatural* for the *supernatural*; too great fearfulness of small evils to the neglect of great good; not for this is our whole spiritual edifice to be destroyed. Our minds are limited and faulty, and only by an occasional dipping of the balance to one side or another is equilibrium preserved. But if, for a little while past, our spiritual writers have spoken more of the ever present need of cutting and pruning, so now the hour may have come to bring again into prominence, not the new, but the old truth of the sacredness of the individual, and the holy liberty of the children of God.

This world does not always lead straight to the next, and we must shut our ears to earthly din to listen to the music of the spheres. But if nature must be tamed that grace may prevail, so also may she be introduced in lowly garb into the courts of heaven, to be illumined by their splendour. Our earth is a place of suffering and probation, of trial and weakness, but it has also been likened, and rightly so, to the "Great Altar Stairs that slope through darkness up to God."

M. D. Petre.

Kensington, London.

## THE FIRST PRIEST OF AMERICA.

THE current of European migration across the Atlantic flowed slowly at first. Twenty years after Columbus had revealed the New World to the Old, a single small colony in tropical San Domingo was the only American soil occupied by the white man. That island had been selected for Spanish settlement by Columbus on his first voyage, and the towns of Isabella and San Domingo founded by him on his second expedition, but no rush of colonists followed for some years. The experience of the first settlers with tropical fevers, and the hardships inseparable from life in new countries, soon quenched the popular enthusiasm which had greeted the great discovery of Columbus. Of twenty-five hundred men brought out by Ovando in 1502 over a thousand died in a few months. In Granada at an earlier period a crowd of returned emigrants besieged the King's Court for months and mobbed the sons of Columbus in the streets. When Diego Columbus came to San Domingo as Governor in 1509 the whole European population of the Colony did not exceed four or five thousand, mostly men, like the population of a California or Australian mining camp in our own days. It is significant that his wife was accompanied by a large number of marriageable young ladies of high birth and small fortunes, who came to find husbands among the colonists, as English ladies afterwards were wont to do in India. As in California and Australia, too, gold mining was the chief motive which brought immigrants to San Domingo. The resemblance to an Australian population was strengthened by the fact that many of the settlers of San Domingo were convicts, who had been given liberty on condition of emigration to the new lands. The details of early Spanish colonial life preserved in contemporary writings are very numerous. Oviedo and Las Casas, both historians of mark, were among the first settlers and their works, with others, enable a modern reader to form an almost photographic picture of early Spanish colonial life. Its resemblance to that of our own California pioneers is very striking. There was the same energy and contempt of danger or hardships, the same spirit of mutual helpfulness, and free spending, the same sudden changes from poverty to wealth and wealth to poverty, and the same rough recklessness of moral conduct mixed with generosity and often with strong religious feeling.

In political matters, this first colony of Europeans in America

was organized more fully than an ordinary Spanish municipality at home. The Governor represented the King with almost royal authority, an Audiencia, or Supreme Court, administered the laws of Castille, a royal agent superintended commerce, and each town had an organization modelled on that of a Spanish city, with elected Councilors, Mayor, Sheriff and other officials. The colony practically ruled its own destinies in spite of the loyalty to the crown, which was strong in every Spanish breast at that time. The wearer of the crown, in fact, had little time to interfere, except in a few general directions, with the doings of his subjects four thousand miles away in a land and among a people so foreign to European life. The relations between the colonists and the native Indians are a striking illustration of this fact. Isabella and Ferdinand had strictly enjoined on Columbus and his successors that the natives should not be molested or enslaved. Nevertheless both vassalage and actual slavery had grown up in San Domingo within five years after its discovery. It was the worst blot on the moral character of colonial life as compared with life at home, but it was not so regarded by the colonists themselves. It is easy for a community, as for an individual, to form a false moral conscience for itself where its material interests are concerned. We have no need to look far for instances to-day. The extermination of the Tasmanians followed closely the abolition of the slave trade by the English Parliament in the present century, and the kidnapping of South Sea Islanders has been freely practised under the English flag while British war vessels were hunting slavers on the African coasts. The early Spanish settlers of the West Indies persuaded themselves that it was a duty of humanity to make the Indians work—somewhat in the spirit that suggested the "White Man's burthen" to a modern writer.

Among the twenty-five hundred settlers who came to San Domingo with the Governor Ovando in 1502 was a young man of twenty-eight years whose father had sailed with Columbus on his first voyage across the Atlantic, and who had himself seen the sailing of the famous Caravels from Palos. Bartholome Casas or Las Casas had made his studies in the University of Salamanca before seeking his fortune in America. His father had grown wealthy as a ship builder, and a brilliant career seemed to promise itself to him in San Domingo. He was a trained business man as well as a scholar, a good speaker and of a constitution which seemed to defy alike fatigue and illness. Whatever work came to his hand he threw himself into with untiring energy, and at the same time he had the art of making devoted friends among every

class of the colonists, from the Governor to the ticket of leave men. It was a surprise, then, when after eight years of active business Las Casas, at the age of thirty-six, asked for admission to the priesthood. Such vocations, indeed, appear to have been exceptionally numerous among the Spaniards of that century. Calderon, the Shakespeare of Spain, and his great rival, Lope de La Vega, both entered the Church at the age of fifty. Ignatius of Loyola had been a soldier, Francis Borgia a Viceroy of Catalunia, and Urdaneta, the founder of the Philippine Mission, a sea captain before taking Holy Orders. "Fraile que fue soldado sale mas acertado," "the old soldier makes the steadfast friar," was a common Spanish proverb and it was well borne out by the life of Bartholome Las Casas.

His wish was readily fulfilled. San Domingo had been made a diocese soon after its first settlement and the Bishop accepted the gifted candidate and ordained him with much solemnity in 1510. Las Casas was the first man to receive Holy Orders on American soil, and it was made the occasion of an enthusiastic celebration by the whole Catholic population of San Domingo. The Governor Diego Columbus attended the ceremony and the municipality of San Domingo declared a holiday and held a tournament to honor the first "New Mass" of America.

It was not to shirk labor or danger that Las Casas had become a priest, and his energies found plenty of employment in his new career. After eighteen years' experience of colonial life in San Domingo the Spanish people was about to spread over the great continent which Columbus had given to Castile and Leon. A few months before the ordination of Las Casas, Ojeda had sailed to found Darien, the first permanent settlement on the American continent. A few months later Velasquez was sent by Diego Columbus to occupy Cuba. There was some fighting with the Indians of that island at first, but it was soon ended by the swords and horses of the civilized invaders, and the exploration of the country went on rapidly. Las Casas was sent as chaplain to the little army of Velasquez in Cuba and shared in its toilsome work. In company with the captain, Naervaez, and a hundred soldiers, he made the first expedition to what is now Havana and took an active part in its foundation. He has left a lively description of this campaign in his history. He was associated in authority with Naervaez and found ample work in repressing the excesses of the soldiers and protecting the helpless natives. At an Indian town in Camaguey there was a sudden outbreak of violence. The party had marched for several hours under a broiling sun and the temp-

ers of the soldiers were in a state of nervous tension, like that among the American troops at Manila at the outbreak of hostilities with the Filipinos. When the Indian town was reached the inhabitants gathered around the strangers, and a soldier lost his head and attacked them with his sword. The excitement spread and a massacre of the Indians followed. Las Casas was in a large hut disposing the baggage and preparing for the issue of rations when the trouble began. Five Spaniards were in his company and they caught the panic and attacked the Indians in the hut. Las Casas stopped their violence and rushed out to the open, where he saw bodies lying like sheaves of corn all around. He dashed among the excited soldiers, struck the weapons from the hands of some, called the bewildered officers to their duty and finally stopped the slaughter. "What do you think these Spaniards are at," exclaimed Naervaez when Las Casas found him amid the turmoil. "I commend them and you to the devil," was the emphatic if somewhat discourteous answer. When the soldiers were at last got under control an investigation was made, but no reason could be given for the outbreak. It was simply an outburst of unreasoning alarm. Las Casas got the men into a new camp and through his Indian attendants opened communications with the fugitives who had completely deserted their town. After a few days a body of two hundred came to beg his protection, and the sight of their terror and misery made a deep impression on the sensitive heart of Las Casas. He assured them of safety and got them back to their homes, went among them, baptised the infants and did all he could to allay their fears. The expedition proceeded on to what is now the province of Havana, and Las Casas took every precaution to prevent the recurrence of massacres. The soldiers were kept strictly apart from the Indian attendants both on march and in camp and further bloodshed was prevented. In Havana Naervaez, who was nearly as reckless of native life as a modern naval officer in Samoa, seized about twenty chiefs on the charge of deserting their villages and proposed to execute them as an example of the power of civilized man. This atrocity was prevented by the energetic remonstrances of Las Casas and the Indian chiefs were restored to liberty.

Four towns were laid out by Velasquez at the end of his explorations, Havana and Santiago being among the number. A large part of the Indians were given to different Spanish settlers in "encomienda," a kind of feudal system copied from European practice in the middle ages. An Indian village was assigned, during the good pleasure of the Royal Government, to a private indi-

vidual to govern, protect, and develope, and incidentally to collect rent and service from the Indians. In much the same way William the Conqueror had partitioned out the Anglo-Saxons and their lands among his Norman soldiers after the conquest of England. The system was quite distinct from personal slavery, which also existed both of Negroes and Indians at that time. The Governor granted an Indian village near the site of the actual city of Cienfuegos to Las Casas in partnership with a friend, Pedro de la Renteria. They started a plantation there like other colonists, with their Indian vassals as laborers. The duties of Las Casas as a priest among the scattered and scanty population left him a good deal of leisure, and active occupation was a necessity for his nature. The Indians in his encomienda were treated with kindness, but the scrupulous Las Casas confesses that he devoted himself too much to mere worldly business during this period.

While Las Casas was thus engaged in Cuba a movement in behalf of the Indians under Spanish rule had been begun in San Domingo. The first American convent of the Dominican order was founded in the last island a few months after the ordination of Las Casas. The community came from San Esteban in Salamanca, a house famous in Spanish colonial history, and its rule and practice were highly austere. Besides abstaining from meat the friars in San Domingo excluded the ordinary Spanish provisions, wine, oil and wheaten bread, from their refectory, and lived in the greatest poverty. There were several excellent preachers among them, and the thatched chapel of their convent attracted large audiences and fervent penitents. It is worth noting that the Prior Pedro de Cordova was also charged with the functions of Inquisitor and the first representative of the famous Spanish Inquisition in the New World. It is strange that his first work should have been the defence of the heathen Indians against his fellow Christians. The Dominicans were shocked at the treatment of the natives from their first arrival. The community consulted together and Father Montesinos, as the result, astonished the public of San Domingo by a vigorous condemnation of their treatment of the Indians. A deputation at once went to the convent and complained of the preacher, as crazy, to the Prior. They told him that if his community held the same sentiments they had better return to Spain. The Prior promised an answer on the next Sunday, when Father Montesinos again mounted the pulpit and not only repeated his former discourse but added that no Dominican priest would absolve any man who made incursions on the Indians. The colonial authorities took up the matter and sent an

agent to Spain to report the Inquisitor to the Court as a stirrer up of Sedition. Pedro de Cordova sent Father Montesinos to Spain to plead the cause of the natives and afterwards went himself on the same mission. Father Montesinos succeeded in getting an audience with the King, Ferdinand, and laid a written statement before him. Ferdinand called a Junta to examine the case, composed of some of the ministers and some theologians. The Junta decided positively that the Indians were by right freemen and should be treated as such and paid for any work done for Spaniards. A code known as the Laws of Burgos was drawn up for their protection and officially published on the 27th of December, 1512. These laws were not by any means perfect, but they were the beginning of a system of legislation which ultimately rooted out Indian slavery in Spanish America.

Las Casas, with all his sympathies for the Indians, had not at first seen the injustice of the vassalage imposed on them. He had held Indian vassals himself in San Domingo, and was once refused absolution by a priest of some order on that ground, but he considered it a mere scruple on the confessor's part. When settled in Cuba on his plantation the thought that after all the friar's doctrine might be the simple truth came strongly upon him. He had to prepare a sermon for Whitsunday in 1514 and was then alone, his friend Releria being away in Jamaica on business. Certain texts in Ecclesiasticus struck him forcibly and after some days' reflection he decided, both from considerations of abstract right and of the occurrences daily happening around him, that the whole system of vassalage and slavery of the Indians was tyranny and injustice. His mind once made up he waited on Velasquez and told him his conclusion, adding that he believed it was one which affected the salvation of Velasquez and the other colonists as well as his own. He declared that he felt bound in conscience to give up his Indian vassals, and only asked the Governor not to publish it before the return of Renteria.

He did not wait for that event, however, to make known his belief to the world. On the Feast of the Assumption he published it from the pulpit and warned his hearers of the danger to their souls if they retained the natives in slavery. Some were as much surprised as if he had told them it was sinful to work their oxen or horses, but others were sincerely affected by his discourse. The great majority treated him as a well meaning crank. Quite enough had been done for the Indians, they thought, by the Laws of Burgos. These laws, in fact, as applied by the local authorities, were scarcely of more value to the natives than the Poor Law of O'Connell's time to the rack rented Irish peasantry.

Renteria, the partner of Las Casas, was of a very different opinion when he returned. During his absence he had thought much and seriously on the miseries of the natives under their civilized masters. He had made a retreat in a Franciscan community, and the decision he had then come to in Jamaica was the same as that formed by Las Casas on his Cuban ranches. On the night of his return he astonished his partner by the announcement that he intended to go to Spain and get a royal license to establish schools for the Indian children where they might be saved from the destruction which seemed hanging over their race. Las Casas, in reply, told his own projects, which were to also go to Spain and seek efficient legal protection for the abused natives. Renteria begged him to do so, and offered his whole property to carry out the plan. The indians were given up, the stock and farm sold and with the money Las Casas started for Spain to begin a life-long struggle for justice to the Indian race.

He found active allies in the Dominicans of San Domingo, where Pedro de Cordova had returned after the publication of the Laws of Burgos. He had got permission to found missions along the coast of South America, away from the violence of the ordinary settlers, and he brought fourteen Dominicans for that purpose from the Convent of San Esteban. The first mission was sent to the coast of Venezuela, near Trinidad, and was conducted by Father Montesino, the same who had so energetically denounced the oppressions of the San Domingo colonists. Montesinos, however, was attacked by fever at Puerto Rico and had to remain there for a time while his two companions went on. They landed near Cumana, were well received by the natives and took their abode among them. A short time afterwards a vessel touched at the coast, and kidnapped several Indians. The Dominicans were at once seized by the other natives and after some time put to death. One was a near relative of the Prior.

It was just after this martyrdom that Las Casas reached San Domingo on his way to Spain. Father DeCordova was preparing to establish another mission undaunted by his cousin's death, but he cordially approved the project of Las Casas. He warned him, however, from his own experience, to expect little from the officials then in charge of American affairs, especially Bishop Fonseca, the President of the Council of the Indies. He also sent Father Motesinos with him as one not unfamiliar with the ways of politics in Spain, of which the American priest had no experience. They sailed from San Domingo in 1515 and got safely to Seville. Father Montesino introduced Las Casas to the Archbishop of that

city, who had been a Dominican. The Archbishop gave him letters of introduction to some of the courtiers and to Ferdinand himself. The chaplain from the jungles of Cuba had to figure in the highest political circles of Europe.

His experience is graphically told in his own history. The administration of the Spanish Government in the sixteenth century appears in a very different light in his pages from what it does in popular history. The Court of Ferdinand had more resemblance to the Cabinet of an American President like Jackson than to the stately surroundings of royalty in our own times. Private individuals like Las Casas or Father Montesinos made their way into the King's apartments and got attention to their statements, if worth it, in a very direct way. Public affairs were referred to committees to thresh out and report upon, and the interested parties talked to ministers and dignitaries with as much freedom as ordinary citizens to-day address a Governor. The statesmen of the day had their hands full of business also. Las Casas once sat up four nights in the private room of the Chancellor of Spain examining papers which that official would not let out of his own possession, but was ready to let his visitor examine while he worked himself at other business. The King's preachers, on another occasion, walked into the Council of the Indies and warned the members of that body that they were risking the loss of their souls if they did not do justice to the Indians of America. There was no lack of freedom or energy among the men who governed Spain in these days.

Las Casas, with Archbishop Beza's letter, got an audience with Ferdinand in person and laid a statement of the wrongs of the Indians and colonial misgovernment before him about Christmas of 1515. The King heard him attentively and promised a longer hearing at a later day, but he was old and ill and never had the chance to give it. His death within a month threw back any consideration of the Indian problem for the present. Bishop Fonseca, the President of the Council of Colonial Administration, was much more of a politician than a priest and took little interest in humanitarian projects. At an interview with Las Casas, when the latter told how seven thousand Indians had perished in three months in consequence of some Spanish expedition. Fonseca rudely said: "What is that to me or the King, you queer fool?" "If it is nothing "to you or to the King that all these souls should perish to whom "is it then? O great and eternal God," was the answer, and with that Las Casas left, feeling convinced that the cause of right had little chance in the Council of the Indies while Bishop Fonseca ruled.

Fonseca's influence, however, was waning. On the death of Ferdinand the heir to the Crown of Castille was his grandson, afterwards the famous Charles V, but then a boy of sixteen, living in his native Flanders. Pending his coming of age a Regent, with royal powers, had to take the government of Castile. For this post Ferdinand named the Primate, Cardinal Ximenes, unquestionably the ablest public man of Europe. Ximens was then seventy-eight; about the same age as the late Mr. Gladstone when he retired from public life. Like Gladstone, Ximenes was a scholar as well as a statesman, and like him, too, he kept the fire of youth and a marvelous capacity for work in his age. The Flemish ministers of Charles accepted his appointment, but sent an Embassador to represent the young King in Spain. The Embassador was the Dean of Louvain, Adrian, a Belgian by birth and afterwards Pope under the title of Adrian VI. Within a few months after the death of Ferdinand Las Casas got an introduction to Adrian, and gave him a full statement in Latin of the condition of the Indians in the colonies. The Dean, reared in the orderly life of the Belgian free cities, was astounded at the tale. When he had read it he walked directly into the apartment of Ximenes and asked him could such things occur. Ximenes had not taken much part before in the affairs of America, but when his attention was thus called to them he felt the same indignation as Dean Adrian. In spite of his years and other labors he at once took up the task of reform. Las Casas was called in within a few days, and the Cardinal, a keen judge of men, quickly decided that a sweeping change in the government of the West Indies was required by justice. To decide with Ximenes was to act. He at once named a committee of four, on whose honesty and experience he could rely, to examine thoroughly the facts of the colonial administration. Las Casas was called repeatedly before this body, at whose meetings the Regent himself was often present. Ximenes was soon convinced of the ability of the priest from the colonies and he empowered him and a member of the Council of the Indies, a skilled lawyer, to draw up a new code of Indian administration. At the request of Las Casas Father Montesinos, the fearless preacher of San Domingo, was made a third member of the committee. With all his fervid enthusiasm Las Casas was eminently practical in business and Ximenes likewise. The committee met almost every day for several hours. Las Casas, as best acquainted with the actual state of things in America, drafted the heads of the needed reforms. Father Montesinos added suggestions drawn from his own experience in the Indies and Dr. Rubio, the lawyer member, contributed others

from his knowledge of Indian administration at home, he having been a member of the Council of the Indies. When the committee had thus put the different points of the proposed legislation into practical form they were carefully examined and amended by Ximenes and Dean Adrian, his colleague. There was no lack of criticism on the part of the numerous parties about the Court interested in Indian plantations and mines. The Regent heard objections and decided promptly on their worth. He suggested that a plan of European immigration should be prepared, but he waived it for the time, not to complicate the work in hand. On the point of the right of the Indians to freedom he was thoroughly decided. Las Casas, who feared at first to assert broadly his own judgment, asked at a meeting once: "With what justice can these things be "done whether the natives are freemen or not?" "Who doubts "they are free? Of course they are," was the emphatic answer of the Cardinal Regent.

The work to be done and quickly was of its own nature enough to try the ablest minds. The first settlement of the West Indies had been undertaken with the best intentions for the welfare and conversion of the Indians. Isabella's instructions to Columbus strictly forbade oppression or violence, and when Indian prisoners of war were sent to Spain as slaves she condemned the act in indignant language, and ordered their immediate restoration to their country and freedom. Men of high character had been sent out as Governors and each of them, Bobadilla, Ovando, and Columbus himself had received the strictest orders to protect the natives, yet in spite of all a colonial system had grown up which was destroying them at an unparalled rate. Of forty thousand natives of San Domingo placed under Spanish grantees in 1510 only fourteen thousand could be found four years later. The colonists themselves had become demoralized by their surroundings, and men of good character at home were committing atrocities in the West Indian islands. This experience was new to the statesmen of the sixteenth century, though it has been so often repeated in the history of European colonization since as to have become a commonplace. To give the native Americans knowledge of the Christian faith and to raise them to the level of Europeans in Christian colonization had been the object of Isabella and Columbus as it was of Las Casas. He might well ask if it were likely that where they had failed he, a simple priest, without wealth, rank or political experience, could succeed. He fully appreciated the difficulties before him, but he felt that duty called and through fifty years he continued his self-appointed task.

At the moment it looked as if it were near accomplishment. The abilities of the greatest statesmen of the age, and the virtual sovereign of Castile were devoted to finding a practical system of civilizing the Indians without oppression. In brief outline the plan adopted by Ximenes was to stop the grants of Indian districts to individual Spaniards and to organize the Indians into village communities under their own chiefs. The powers of the chiefs were to be limited. They might punish by whipping, but no higher penalty, and were only to get a larger share in the common property of the tribe as the profits of office. Each native was to have his own cabin and garden, but the bulk of the land was to be held and cultivated in common. Provision was made, however, that with the progress of civilization among the Indians, individuals might get land and cattle in direct ownership. Mining was to be carried on under Indian overseers and for the profit of the natives themselves after payment of a royalty to the government. In every village there was to be a church, a school for the children and a hospital and poor house. Indian schoolmasters were to be trained as soon as possible and meantime Europeans were to be employed and paid out of the village common fund. A Spanish administrator was to have charge of every group of three or four villages, to administer justice and promote public works, but neither the administrator nor other Spaniards, except the priests and schoolmasters, might reside permanently in the Indian villages. The enslaving or oppressing of any natives was forbidden under heavy penalties. The Spanish colonists might cultivate their own farms or work mining claims with the help of their negro slaves, but they were forbidden to employ the Indians as laborers under any pretext. An exception was made of Caribs, a particularly fierce and cannibal race. It was allowed to keep them as slaves on the ground of protection for other Indians from their attacks. Las Casas objected flatly to this enslaving of Caribs, but Ximenes did not feel warranted in following his advice in the face of the numerous representations in a contrary sense. On the other hand Ximenes objected to the importation of negroes as dangerous, while Las Casas did not agree with him. Cattle and tools were to be furnished the Indian villages by the government, the price to be repaid afterwards from the revenues of each community.

The details of administration determined, it remained to find competent administrators. Ximenes desired Las Casas to select them, but he declined on the ground of his little acquaintance with European public life. He gave, however, a statement of the qualifications required and Ximenes read it and decided to select a gov-

erning commission from the Jeronymite Friars. They were a body in high reputation, and had no previous connection with the West Indies, hence he had reason to expect they would be competent and impartial. His action was characteristic and rapid. He wrote at once to the General of the order, stating his wishes and asking for twelve names to be submitted to himself. The General called a chapter, made the list and forwarded it by two Priors to Madrid. Ximenes came the same day to the Jeronymite Convent, in that city, with Dean Adrian and a number of courtiers. He and Adrian were received in the Sacristy of the Church by the Prior and after thanking the General for compliance he ordered Las Casas to be called in. Bishop Fonseca and the other courtiers were left outside. Ximenes handed the list of names to Las Casas and desired him to set out that evening to the residence of the General of the Jeronymites and there select three administrators from the twelve and bring the first at hand immediately to Seville, where the Regent was himself going. He added that the necessary funds were ready then. Las Casas modestly declared that he had enough for his own expenses, but Ximenes laughed and remarked: "Go away, Father, I am richer than you." Las Casas lost no time in carrying out his instructions. He made his selection and brought the three Jeronymite priors to Seville in a few days. They got full powers to govern and were instructed to begin by taking away all grants of Indians from non-residents, officials and corporate bodies. They were also to examine the conduct of the colonial officials, especially the judges, strictly, and to remove all guilty of injustice from office. A veteran lawyer of high character, Zuazo, was appointed Supreme Judge for all the West Indies, with absolute power to remove any official without appeal. The three commissioners were directed to call a convention of all the chief colonists and lay before it the new legislation and the reasons for its adoption. They were to take the opinions and advice of this body, but the final decision was left with themselves. They were also to visit the Indian villages, explain the plans of the government for their future administration and get the opinions of the leading men among them on these points. They were to use every means to gain the confidence of the natives and convince them of their own good will and ability to protect them against oppression. After these investigations they were to commence the establishment of the Indian village communities on the plan of Las Casas and Ximenes. If they found it best, for a time, to leave Indians under the authority of their actual encomenderos, they might do so, but Ximenes strictly charged that none but men of good character should be left in

possession of such grants. His own desire was that the system of encomiendas should be abolished and the Indians made absolutely free from any authority except the general government.

The energy with which Ximenes worked, even in his eightieth year, pushed this legislation into speedy action. The Jeronymite Commissioners and Las Casas, who was appointed to the new office of Protector of the Indians, sailed from Spain with full powers and reached San Domingo before the end of the year in which Ferdinand died. The Commissioners got to work at once, but their progress was somewhat slow for the zeal of Las Casas. They took away the Indian vassals from all absentee grantees, including several members of the Council of the Indies and other powerful men in Spain. They went among the natives and got a good deal of their confidence, so that gross oppression was considerably lessened. They wrote to the Governor of Darien, Pedrarias, to stop incursions on the native population and to set free the slaves made unjustly already. They were, however, slow to take away the Indian vassals of the resident officials. The colonists protested that to do so was to put a mark of disgrace on the most prominent of their number, and the Commissioners suspended action in the matter for the time. Las Casas, with his more thorough knowledge of the country, felt that vigorous and immediate action was needed to save the Indian population. While the officials in San Domingo professed obedience to the new laws, kidnapping of Indians was going on in Trinidad and other outlying points with their connivance. As "Protector of the Indians" Last Casas brought charges of specific acts of tyranny against the members of the Colonial Council. The Commissioners thought his action hasty and did not support him. Las Casas consulted with Father de Cordova, the Provincial of the Dominicans, and also with the Supreme Judge, Zuazo, both men who shared his own views, and by their advice he determined to return to Spain five months after his arrival in San Domingo. It was at the Court that the work must be done while Ximenes yet ruled. The system of grants of Indians had, he felt, to be entirely abolished and imperative laws to that effect could only be got in Spain. The Commissioners went on with the work of gathering the natives into settlements to some extent, but Las Casas sailed for Europe and got to Seville by July, 1517.

He found Ximenes dying, but still at work like a young man. The Regent was carried to his official duties muffled in furs with hot water bottles under his feet and a globe filled with water to relieve his hands from the chill of age, but he still showed his old

fearless energy in everything. He saw Las Casas, but before any new measures could be prepared the end came and the great Cardinal passed away from the work of American legislation just as the young King Charles landed in Corunna on his first visit to Spain. He brought with him the ministry which had governed his native Flanders, and a Flemish Chancellor and Chamberlain became heads of the Government of Castile and Arragon in place of the Spanish Cardinal.

The death of Ximenes was a sore blow to Las Casas. He was thoroughly familiar with the condition of the West Indies and, had he lived, the reforms required would have been secured in a few months, but America and Spain were both new to the Flemish Ministers. They did not even understand Spanish, and the young King himself was only learning the language. The old Council of the Indies and its head, Bishop Fonseca, were, not unnaturally, called back to the management of American affairs, and they were strongly opposed to the plans of Las Casas. Yet he was not daunted by the difficulties, nor did he abandon his self-imposed task of protecting the Indians. Among other papers he had brought letters from some French Franciscan missionaries in the Indies who were acquainted with Monsieur Selvage, the new Chancellor. These served as an introduction. Las Casas spoke French and Latin and he had a wonderful power of making friends at all times of his life. Within a few months he was on terms of intimacy with the Chancellor, had gained his sympathy for his own plans, and won his confidence to such a degree that all important papers and dispatches from America were submitted to Las Casas. He translated them into Latin and added his own comments for the benefit of the Chancellor. The latter brought them to the notice of the King, Charles, who though only eighteen, was beginning to take an active part in the government. Charles was greatly impressed with the story told of the New World and became interested in Las Casas. The Chancellor had caught a share in the American priest's enthusiasm and pleaded the cause of the natives constantly in his interviews with the King. There was little leisure indeed at the time for either King or Chancellor. The King's grandfather, Maximilian, was dying, and the Austrian dominions would fall to Charles at his death as well as Flanders, Naples and Spain, each with their own difficulties. With the administration of nearly half Europe on their shoulders it is remarkable that both Charles and his Ministers should have given attention to the government of the West Indian islands, which were hardly of more importance in the Empire than Alaska is to-day

in our own government. They gave it, however, and after some months the Chancellor gladdened the heart of Las Casas with the information: "The Master bids you and me find reforms for the "Indies. Get your statements ready."

Las Casas was at work immediately. He took as a basis the system being carried out by the Jeronymite Commissioners, and added provisions for abolishing all grants of personal service, and securing the Indians the same rights as the Spanish subjects of the King. The provisions for their instruction and training were even ampler. He also suggested a scheme of immigration of free European farmers and laborers, assisted by government. His memorials were read and approved by the Chancellor, who submitted them to Charles. The Council of the Indies opposed Las Casas at every step, but the Chancellor supported him, and at last a Council was called to settle the matter. With the favorable disposition of the King and Chancellor, Las Casas had full hopes that now the cause of Indian rights would be won. A terrible disappointment came. The Chancellor was taken ill a few days before the day named for the meeting and died after three days' illness. The meeting was never held. A new Council of the Indies, with Bishop Fonseca as its President, was appointed, and left full control of the colonies. A respectable but easy-going dignitary became Chancellor, and he listened patiently to the pleadings of Las Casas, but did nothing. The King had his attention fully occupied and Fonseca was left a free hand in American affairs. He used it to recall the Jeronymite Commissioners after an administration of less than two years in the West Indies. The system of Ximenes was abandoned practically and Las Casas, in his own words, "went down to the depths."

Still he did not give up. With a firm confidence in the justice of the cause he had taken up he continued to bring it before the Council of the Indies and his friends around the Court. The plan of sending out a peaceful colony of Spanish farmers was what he now devoted himself to. Bishop Fonseca declared it impracticable and Las Casas offered to get three thousand settlers of good character if the government would guarantee them free passage, land and a year's support after landing in San Domingo. The Bishop declared it would cost as much as to raise an army, and hot words passed in the Council between him and Las Casas. The latter secured more friends among the young French and Belgian companions of the King. One was the Master of the Household, De Laxao, a particular favorite with Charles. He and his friends took warmly to Las Casas and furnished him money to remain at Court.

His own funds, got from the sale of his farm in Cuba, were quite gone and it was only by the help of friends he was able to find food and lodging while battling alone against the forces of the Colonial office and the West Indian planters. While he was hard pushed to pay for his lodgings Father de Cordova and the other protectors of the natives thought him all powerful at Court. The Inquisitor wrote telling of various cruelties committed by the Spanish adventurers in Darien, and on what was called the Pearl Coast, now Venezuela, and asking Las Casas to get a grant of a hundred leagues of that coast as a field for exclusively mission work. No Spaniards were to be allowed to enter this territory except the Dominicans and Franciscans, who were ready to go alone among the natives to convert and civilize them. Las Casas brought this proposal before the Council, but Fonseca rejected it. "The King would be a wise man," he said, ironically, "to give away a hundred leagues of land for nothing." Las Casas argued in vain on this point.

A new Chancellor was appointed to fill the post of Selvage. This was Gattinara, one of the famous statesmen of the Sixteenth Century and prominent in the wars and treaties of Charles V. and Francis I. of France. Las Casas got introduced to him by Cardinal Adrian, of Louvain, the former colleague of Ximenes. He made an equally favorable impression on Gattinara as on his predecessor and Fonseca was forced to give way a little. Las Casas was empowered to collect emigrants willing to go to the West Indies. He travelled through Castile, collected the people in the different villages and towns and published the advantages offered. The numbers willing to go were far greater than the three thousand he had undertaken to find, but Fonseca blocked all further progress of this plan, which might have made San Domingo a European instead of a negro land. An officer placed under Las Casas by the Council left him by permission of Fonseca and gathered a couple of hundred loungers of the cities as emigrants. This ill selected crowd was shipped off by the Indian Council on the first vessel without provision for its support either on shipboard or after landing. Numbers died in consequence. Las Casas, by dint of complaints, got some supplies sent after them, but as the Council refused to provide sufficiently for the emigrants he had enrolled he refused to proceed further in the business. Such was the end of the first attempt at assisted emigration to America.

Finding it impossible to get his emigration plan carried out under the management of the government the unwearied Las Casas devised a new project, based on the suggestion already made by

Father Cordova. He applied for a grant of land on the South American continent, to be settled entirely under his own authority. He would organize a company of fifty colonists possessed of sufficient means to defray the necessary cost of ships, provisions and tools, and he would compensate them by land grants in the colony and the right of mining for gold and fishing for pearls. He demanded that the natives within his province should be granted full freedom forever, and that such of them as had already been carried as slaves to the West Indies should be placed in his charge to return to their homes. He also required twelve Franciscan and Dominican priests to be sent with him for the instruction and conversion of the Indians, and that no soldiers or adventurers should be allowed to land without his permission. The Council of the Indies had rejected Father Cordova's request for territory on the ground that no profit was to be given to the Government. Las Casas offered to raise a revenue of fifteen thousand dollars at the end of three years, to be increased to seventy-five thousand in ten and to further build three forts in that time, keep the Indians in peace and establish the rule of Spain through the province which corresponded nearly with the actual Republic of Venezuela. It was then wholly unsettled by white men, though there was a station of Spanish pearl fishers on the Island of Cubaqua, near Trinidad. For himself Las Casas asked nothing in the way of either compensation or dignity. His plan was very like that carried out by the Franciscans in California two hundred and fifty years later, or by Lagaspi in the Philippines. In both cases the result was to build up a large population of Christian natives fairly civilized and had Las Casas been fairly treated he would, in all likelihood, have done the same in Venezuela.

As it was, he met with opposition on every hand. Some of his clerical friends were shocked at the worldly details of the project which they thought hardly consistent with a true missionary spirit. The King's confessor, Father Aguirre, who had always supported Las Casas in his work, was one of these friendly critics. Las Casas answered him characteristically: "Tell me, Father," said he, "were "you to see our Lord in captivity and abused would you ask his "liberty from his captors urgently?" "Certainly," replied Father Aguirre. "Then," continued Las Casas, "if they would only re- "lease him for a price, would you pay it, if in your power?" "By "all means," said Aguirre. "Well, then, that is what I am doing "now," was the final argument. "I see our Lord daily maltreated "and scourged in the persons of His Indian human creatures. I "have asked those in power to grant them to me for the sake of

"the Holy Gospel, but they have refused unless I would pay a "price in gold. So now I am raising that price for the end of free- "ing our Lord in his creatures." One thinks of the words of a modern writer on another old Catholic hero: "The great heart "of the man so like a child's in its simplicity; so manlike in its "earnest strength." Father Aguirre cordially agreed with Las Casas on his explanation, as well he might.

It was different with the opposition of the officials and money hunters around the Court. Bishop Fonseca, in contrast with most of the clergy, fought the cause of monopoly and slavery stoutly. He blocked the application of Las Casas with endless delays in the Council, with sneers at its practicability, with the arguments of men of every kind interested in keeping up the slavery of the Indians. There were hot words often between him and Las Casas both in the Council of the Indies and before the Privy Council of Charles. "A lucky man, indeed, is a Councillor of the King," broke out Fonseca once, when arraigned in plain language before a royal council, "if he has to give an account of what he does in the King's service to Casas." "And a more lucky one is Casas," was the energetic answer, "if he has to come two thousand leagues from the "Indies to show the Council what infamies are being done in its "name and to save the King and his councillors from eternal per- "dition if for this he has to face the anger and ill words of the "Council." On another occasion, when the emigration from Spain was under discussion, the Bishop objected to spending money on supporting the emigrants. "It would cost the King more," he said, "than to raise an army." "It seems that your Lordship, having "caused the death of so many Indians, wants to be the death of "Christians as well," was the immediate retort. At a meeting of the Cabinet Las Casas boldly told the King that he was not working to please him, but to do the will of God, and that except for that he would not cross the room for the sake of the royal favor. He added that he then and there renounced and refused any personal reward from the Government, including the salary that had been assigned him as Protector of the Indies by Ximenes. Charles V. showed no irritation at this remarkable declaration, so unusual in courts or cabinets at any time.

Fonseca tried red tape when beaten in argument. He brought forward a higher offer from another party for the province asked by Las Casas. He quibbled over its description and altered its boundaries. Time and again he postponed meetings of the Council and tried to wear out his persistent opponent with the "laws' "delays." After nearly two years had thus been consumed the

Council of the Indies got up a list of objections, thirty in number, to the proposed grant. Most of them were frivolous, some skillfully framed from the notes of the colonial authorities. One was, that Las Casas being a priest, was not a full subject of the Spanish Crown. It is amusing to find the theory of Mr. Gladstone's "Vaticanism" thus used by a Spanish Bishop to prevent the emancipation of heathens in the Sixteenth Century. Another was that he might sell out to the Venetians or Genoese and make off with the wealth of the country if he got the grant. The Council added that they had many other objections to make which could only be told privately to the King himself. Chancellor Gattinara told Las Casas of these charges and that he must answer them. Las Casas was ready, but the Council kept them back, under different pretexts, for months. Finally they were handed to the Chancellor, who showed them to Las Casas and asked him to reply. The papers he could not let out of his hands, and for four nights, as Las Casas tells, he visited Gattinara in his apartments and read over and replied to the official documents. The Chancellor and he worked together till eleven, when a collation was brought in and Las Casas then went to his inn to sleep. When both sides were ready the two papers were submitted to Charles, who ordered the grant of Venezuela to be made to Las Casas. The Council still opposed and a Council was held in the presence of Charles, now elected Emperor of Germany, as well as Monarch of Spain, to give a final decision. After a session of several days, in which the Colonial officials, the newly returned Bishop of Darien, the Admiral Diego Columbus and Las Casas were all heard at length, the plans of Las Casas were fully approved. The grant was signed by the Emperor the day before he left the Spanish Capital for Germany, where he was crowned Emperor.

Las Casas was left to begin his colony with what resources he could raise on his own account. He borrowed from friends, bought a vessel, collected a number of prospective settlers and sailed a few months after the signing of his grant. But if he had conquered the obstacles before him in Spain, new and more dangerous ones awaited him in America. The Dominicans and Franciscans had established missions near Cumana the year before and were living unprotected among the Indians. They had succeeded in learning the language and gaining the confidence of the tribes around them when a Spanish vessel from Cubagua made a raid to seize Indian laborers for the pearl fisheries. The Indians broke out, destroyed the two convents, killed the two Dominicans and a Franciscan and then attacked Cubagua and drove out the Spanish

settlers. When Las Casas and his colonists reached Puerto Rico he received news of this outbreak in the land where he was about to try his plan of peaceful colonization. An expedition was on its way to Venezuela to avenge the hostilities of the natives and make as many slaves as possible among them. Las Casas protested against the further progress of the expedition and showed the grant made to himself, but to no purpose. He then had to leave his colonists in Puerto Rico while he went to San Domingo to demand the suspension of hostilities from the governing body there. The Audience did not openly refuse; they delayed sending the necessary orders and they further declared the vessel belonging to Las Casas unseaworthy and so prevented him going on to Venezuela. Finally they proposed to give him two vessels and put the soldiers then on the continent under his authority on his giving them a share in the profits to be drawn from the trading concession within his province. He had to agree, very reluctantly, but when he got to Puerto Rico he found his colonists all scattered. They had been talked over by the planters, who regarded Las Casas and Indian Emancipation with about the same feelings as the Irish rack renting landlords regarded O'Connell and Repeal. The expedition sent to Venezuela did its part to make his peaceful colonization project impossible. The soldiers ravaged the country and sent six hundred Indian prisoners as slaves to San Domingo in defiance of the royal orders. When finally Las Casas reached Cumana he had only forty or fifty hired men to aid in the settlement of a territory as large as Germany and France combined. The Franciscans had restored their convent, but it was the only settlement on the main land. The pearl fishers of Cubagua did everything to add to the already enormous difficulties of the task of Christianizing the Indians. They brought liquor to the Indians and kidnapped them for work in the island. Las Casas went to Cubagua, showed the Royal Order and demanded that these incursions should be stopped, but the officials paid no heed to him. He decided to go to San Domingo for redress, and sailed in a merchant vessel, which was wrecked on the way and it was only after a journey of many days through the swamps that he reached the Capital. Meantime a tribe of Indians attacked his new settlement, killed his manager and one of the Franciscans, and destroyed the whole of the stores provided with so much labor. When Las Casas reached San Domingo it was only to find his colonists there before him and all hope of peaceful intercourse with the natives destroyed for the time.

The blow was terrible even to his indomitable nature. He knew

that his own purpose was right, but he doubted whether God willed its success or whether he was the instrument chosen to carry it out. He took up his quarters in the Dominican Convent, where he was sure of sympathy, though his former ally, Father De Cordova, had passed to his reward while Las Casas was away. A young priest of remarkable character, Father Betanzos, afterwards the Provincial of Mexico and one of the most notable men of that country, had lately come to San Domingo. He urged Las Casas to enter the Dominican Order, and after long reflection he took the solemn vows of obedience and absolute poverty. After prominence in Courts and favor won with the greatest men of the world, with the Emperor Charles V. and the then Pope Adrian he found no more suitable course than to place himself under absolute obedience to the will of a community as strict in its mode of life as La Trappe. The austerities of the Spanish Dominicans were at least as great as those of De Rance in later years. Not only was abstinence from meat perpetual, but also from oil, wine and wheaten bread in the community of San Domingo. Las Casas was nearly fifty when he entered it and many years later, when a Bishop in Central America, he continued to observe all the austerities of the Rule.

For five years he remained almost unnoticed in his convent after the terribly energetic work of former days. He was forbidden to preach by the Audience of the island, but he was not idle. In 1527 he commenced his "History of the Indies," one of the chief sources of information regarding the settlement of this continent. The Dominican authorities continued their efforts to obtain just treatment for the Indians in the meanwhile, and after some years they called Las Casas to Spain and sent him again to the Court of Charles V. on his old mission. Pizarro was then conquering Peru and Las Casas obtained a decree forbidding the enslavement of the natives. He was sent out shortly afterwards to Peru to notify Pizarro and Almagro of this law. On the way he passed through Mexico and took part in a Chapter of the Dominicans there to settle some disputes over the jurisdiction of the Superior in San Domingo. From Mexico, with two companions, he traveled on foot to Realejo, in Nicarauga, found a ship there and sailed to Peru. Having warned the Spanish officials there of the decrees against Indian slavery he returned to Nicaragua, where he founded a convent and devoted himself to missionary work among both Indians and Spaniards for the next four years. He was sent again to Peru during that time, but driven back by storms, and he was called to San Domingo, where he found a congenial work. A

Christian chief had revolted against the oppression of his Spanish feudal lord and kept up a war in the mountains for fourteen years. Las Casas visited him and negotiated terms of peace by which the remnant of the natives of the island were secured their freedom and a large reservation. This task ended, Las Casas returned to his convent in Leon, but not for long. A new Governor, Contreras, was named for Nicaragua in 1534, and shortly after his arrival he planned an expedition against the tribes along the San Juan to establish Spanish dominion there. Las Casas regarded such attacks as simple murder by whatever name they might be gilded. He denounced the proposed campaign so forcibly that many of the soldiers refused to take part in it, and it had to be dropped. On the question of the rights of uncivilized man Las Casas wrote a remarkable work in Latin at this time, "De Unico Modo Con-"versions," "The Only Way to Convert." In it he lays down emphatically that unbelievers can only be made Christians by persuasion, not by force, and secondly, that Christians have no right to make war on unbelievers unless in self defence. This was translated into Spanish and widely circulated through the colonies in 1534. The same year, in England, Cardinal Fisher and Sir Thomas More were sent to the block for declining to acknowledge the religious supremacy of Henry VIII. The contrast is worth noting.

Contreras, however, was not an English statesmen and the liberty of Las Casas was not interfered with. However, the relations between him and the Governor became so strained that Las Casas removed his community to Guatemala the following year. In the latter country he got an opportunity to put his theory into practice. A tribe of natives had been attacked by the Spanish troops unsuccessfully and Las Casas offered to convert and civilize this warlike tribe on the condition that no one but his own religious brethren should be allowed to enter their territory, and that if converted the Government should guarantee them perpetual liberty and possession of their lands subject only to the general laws of Spain. His offer was accepted formally. He set about his task with every precaution which over thirty years' of acquaintance with the natives suggested. He learned their language, composed a statement of the principal Catholic doctrines in it and spread it among the warriors by means of Indian Christians. The chief invited a visit from the Spanish priests, and professed himself a Christian after some time. The majority of the unconquered Indians of the district which was known as the "Land of the War," followed his example. Las Casas got his converts, who were wandering savages, to collect into settlements which he organized on

the plan that he had suggested to Ximenes twenty years before for the natives of the West Indies. There it had never been carried out, owing to the death of the great Cardinal. In Guatemala at last Las Casas had a free field to carry it out practically, and he showed that it was thoroughly practical. The Indians of Vera Paz have continued a free Catholic population to our own day.

For the accomplishment of this remarkable work the indefatigable Las Casas had less than two years' time. He was called to Mexico on business of his order, and from Mexico to Europe to secure Franciscan and Dominican missioners to carry on the work of conversion. In Spain he was kept five years. The Emperor desired his advice on American affairs and he was kept busy with the work of his own order. He found time to write his most remarkable or rather most widely known work, "The Destruction of "the Indies," within a year of his return. In it he summed up with burning earnestness the misdeeds of the European settlers against the native races. The atrocities he chronicled have, indeed, been repeated in almost every other new colony, but they were none the less abhorrent to Las Casas and the statesmen of Spain. It is strange that this work was widely reproduced by the English and Dutch enemies of later Spanish Governments as a proof of the cruelty of the Spanish character. The fact that those cruelties were repressed by the conscience of the Spanish rulers in a way unknown in other lands was ignored. The destruction of the Indians was stopped in Spanish-America, while it continued to the end in the Northern Continent, but neither Holland nor England had a Las Casas to speak for the wronged natives.

Charles V. sympathized fully in the work of Indian Emancipation. He confirmed by public edict the agreement for the perpetual freedom of the Guatemalan converts, and sent titles and presents to their chiefs somewhat to the disgust of the settlers there. Paul III. issued a remarkable brief in 1537 declaring the natives of America capable of receiving all the privileges of Christians and forbidding any Catholic to either enslave or plunder them under pain of excommunication *latae sententiae.* The Spanish Government called a special Assembly in 1542 to provide suitable legislation for the colonies, which now included Peru and Mexico, instead of being confined to a few islands as at the death of Ximenes. A body of laws known as the "New Laws" was enacted and received the signature of Charles in 1542. Las Casas had sixteen measures before this body and had a great, possibly the greatest share, in shaping its decisions. The new legislation consisted of forty clauses. One was as follows:

"We order and command that henceforth, for no cause or pre-"text, whatever, whether war, rebellion, ransom, or any other rea-"son, can any Indian be made a slave."

Other clauses provided that all grants of Indian villages made to the Spanish conquerors on the basis of serfdom, not slavery, should end with the lives of the original grantors and that, meanwhile, no personal service should be allowed on that ground. The grantees might only collect a reasonable rent from the Indian tenants. This measure was similar in character to the Emancipation of the Russian serfs by the late Czar Alexander.

It provoked the most violent opposition through Spanish-America. The brother of Pizarro broke into rebellion in Peru, defeated and killed the viceroy and tried to set up an independent Kingdom in South America. Something similar was threatened in Mexico and three years later Charles V. had to suspend the execution of this part of the "New Laws" through simple inability to enforce it. It was two centuries before the last vestiges of serfdom or peonage were obliterated by Charles III., of Spain, but personal slavery among the Indians at least was abolished by the efforts of Las Casas. At this very time the Parliament of England, under the Protestant rule of Henry, was enacting that any English workman found begging, for want of work, should be made a slave for life to any informant. The contrast speaks sufficiently for the views on human liberty of Catholic Spain and Protestant England.

An unexpected burthen was laid on Las Casas as soon as the New Laws were passed. He was nominated Bishop of Cuzco, in Peru, and though he declined that dignity he was finally obliged by the entreaties of the Dominican Superiors to accept the diocese of Chiapa, in Central America. Again, this time in his seventieth year, he crossed the Atlantic in 1544. Forty Dominican missioners accompanied him to extend the work he had begun of conversion and civilization. The Episcopal dignity made no change in the austerity, which had marked his life as a Dominican. He wore the plainest dress, touched no meat, had no personal furniture except the plainest kind, plate being rigorously excluded from his table. A library was his chief possession, but unfortunately it was lost by shipwreck on the voyage to Guatemala.

His reception in his diocese is graphically told by Remesal, the historian of Guatemala and almost a contemporary. The wealthy colonists regarded Las Casas as the main agent in the hated Emancipation laws. They called him a half trained student; made abusive verses on him, and had their children sing them around

his house, and even fired guns at his windows to scare him. To his demand for the liberation of the slaves, colonists and officials turned a deaf ear. He had to go to Guatemala and appeal to the Judges of the Audience there for the enforcement of the laws. The president of that body roundly abused the fearless bishop and told him he was a scoundrel without shame, a bad man, bad friar, bad bishop, and one that ought to be hanged. "I deserve all your Lordship says," was the half sarcastic answer of Las Casas, who, however, still insisted that a judge should be sent to Chiapa to enforce the law. The Audience was cowed by his courage and promised to send one.

The citizens of Ciudad Real, his see, determined to prevent the Bishop's return by force when they learned of this last measure. Their proceedings, as told by Father Remesel, have a modern Hibernian flavor. When they heard the judge was coming to take their Indians from them the prominent citizens held a meeting and resolved that they had no assurance that Las Casas was really their bishop, as he had never shown them his Bulls. It was further resolved that if he were their bishop he should act like other bishops and if not they would not pay him any temporalities. The final resolution was that they would not let him enter the city unless he would let them be absolved like Christians (Las Casas had forbidden his priests to admit slaveholders to the sacraments) and not try to take away their slaves or fix their rents. A party of Indians were ordered to watch the roads and keep him out mean while.

The Bishop was making his way from Guatemala on foot, accompanied by a Dominican, Father Vicente, and a couple of Spaniards, besides a negro servant. The latter was known as little Johnny, Juanillo, because he was very tall and his duty, like St. Patrick's "strong man" of old, was to carry the Bishop across the deep fords on his way. In this fashion he reached a monastery some miles from Ciudad Real, where he heard news of the proceedings. The monks begged him not to go on as he might be killed. The Bishop would not stop. "If I don't go to Ciudad Real," he said, "I banish myself from my Church. Men's minds change "every hour, and is it possible that God will be so hard with the "men of Ciudad Real as to let them commit such a crime as mur-"dering me. In fine Reverend Fathers, I am going to my "diocese trusting in the mercy of God and the help of your pray-"ers." With that he gathered up his cassock and took the road again though it was late in the evening.

He travelled all night and caught the Indian sentinels asleep.

They naturally did not share in their master's feelings and when awakened they begged his blessing and excused their work. The Bishop was only afraid they might be made to suffer for not stopping him, so with his own hands, aided by Father Vicente, he tied them in a rope and marched them behind himself as prisoners. He reached Ciudad Real at dawn and went straight to the Church, where he called the town councillors to meet him. They came with the whole white population in very bad humor. There had been a smart shock of earthquake during the night and some declared it was a sign of the ruin that was coming on them with the Bishop's arrival. They got to the Church, however, but when the Bishop came out of the sacristy no one saluted him and a notary got up and read the resolutions lately adopted. The Bishop answered with firmness but gently and with his usual eloquence, and was making some impression when a town councillor interrupted him with a saucy speech, declaring it a piece of presumption for the Bishop, whom he described as a private individual, to call them instead of going to the Town Hall. "Look you here, sir," said Las Casas with energy, "when I want anything from your "property I will go to your houses to ask it, but when I have to "talk to you of the services due to God and the concerns of your souls it is my duty to call you to where I may be, and it is yours to "come there fast lest worse happen you." The councillor was silenced and Las Casas stood up to leave when he was asked to name confessors. "With all my heart," said the Bishop, and he gave out four names of priests, all of whom he could rely on in the matter of slaveholding. Father Vicente did not know this and thought Las Casas was giving way, so he caught his vestment and begged him rather to die than do such a thing. This led to a general disturbance among the audience. Two monks of the Order of Mercy came in and brought Las Casas away to their convent for much needed rest. He had travelled all night without food and was getting a breakfast of bread when a mob came around the convent and some forced their way into the cell where he was eating. They had just found their Indians tied up as prisoners and came to urge this new grievance. The Bishop took all responsibility on himself, when another aggrieved citizen burst out with: "O the ways of some people. He is the protector of the "Indians, and look how he binds them, and still he will go and "write against *us* to Spain." Another gave him the vilest language he could command, which Las Casas took with dignified coolness. In the meantime the crowd outside the building fell foul of "Little Johnny" and one of them knocked him down with a pike. Two

energetic young lay brothers now took a hand and drove the angry citizens out of the premises. All this was before nine in the tropical morning, but by midday a change had come over the public mind either from the Bishop's eloquence or the weight of the lay brothers' hands. The Alcaldes came in a body to apologize and the populace at large accompanied them to beg pardon. They went further and carried him off to one of the principal houses, regaled him there in the evening and next day held a tournament in honor of his return. His words about the changeableness of men's minds were certainly verified.

This sudden popularity was not, however, of long duration. When the judge arrived shortly afterwards from Guatemala he told Las Casas respectfully that the unpopularity of the New Laws was enhanced by the fact that he was regarded as their chief author. He begged him to leave his diocese for a while on that account during the prevailing excitement and urged him to go to the Synod then convened at Mexico. Las Casas yielded, went on to Mexico, where his arrival nearly caused a tumult and attended the Synod there. It laid down some very emphatic principles on the question of Indian slavery. One was that unbelievers of every class had, in spite of their unbelief, absolute right over their persons and property, and could not be deprived of this right by Christians without grievous sin. Another was that the Spanish sovereigns had been granted jurisdiction in America by the Holy See solely in order that the Indians might be made Christians by lawful means, not to increase the power or revenues of Spain. A third point was that this grant of supreme national authority did not authorize the taking from the Indian Chiefs of any class their properties or the authority which they possessed already. These principles are in striking contrast to the Acts of Edward the Sixth's English Parliament, at the same time touching the rights of Catholics who refused to accept the Royal Supremacy as the rule of belief.

From Mexico Las Casas returned to Spain, where he resigned his bishopric. His episcopal career was only four years' active duration.

Having resigned his diocese Las Casas took up his residence in the Dominican Convent at Valladolid, but not to rest there in quiet. He was officially recognized as "Protector of the Indians" and no important measure of colonial administration escaped his energetic attention. When Philip II. succeeded his father on the Spanish throne a measure of vital importance to the native race was proposed by an agent of the American grantholders. These

grants, as has been already told, were revoked by Charles V. in 1542, but the revocation had been suspended in consequence of the rebellions in Peru. The policy of the Government was to abolish the whole system as soon as possible and the wealthy proprietors were anxious to have the grants made perpetual. For this they offered a sum of many millions, apparently about three years' revenue of Spain, to Philip, who at the time was confronted with an empty treasury and a formidable war with France. The temptation to establish a system of Russian serfdom in America was very great and Las Casas used all his energies to prevent it. Philip was in England at the time and Las Casas wrote directly to his confessor there asking that his letter should be laid before the King himself. It was a document such as very few rulers ever have addressed to them, and a strange contrast to the servile addresses of the English Parliament to its sovereigns at the same time. Las Casas told Philip that it would be in the highest degree rash for him to make any decision on American policy in England, where he had no means of learning the truth about the Spanish colonies from reliable sources. "What right," he asks, "have our Kings to wring taxes from the toil of the Indians to pay their debts?" "What an atrocity to seek to forward the interests of the King in defiance of God's law." A few sentences in the same letter are remarkable as showing how strict a rule Las Casas applied to his own actions. "A few days since," he wrote, "a member of the Council, hearing this proposition, threatened "me with God's justice and charged me with not half doing my "duty if I did not go and protest effectually against those tyrants "even if I had to beg my way to England with a stick in my hand "and a beggar's sack on my back. What would he have said had "he seen all I have during the last sixty years?" This was strong language for a bishop of over four score years to use of himself and it may serve to explain the severity of his denunciations in his "Destruction of the Indies."

Philip received this bold letter well and wrote in reply asking further information. Charles V., who had retired to a monastery, shared the opinion of Las Casas and his last interference in political affairs was to warn his son against sacrificing the liberty of his subjects. The proposal of the colonial magnates was definitely rejected despite the deficit in the treasury. Spanish honor, after all, has not been an empty word.

The other tasks of Las Casas during the last years of his life are too numerous to tell here. He published his famous "Destruc-"tion of the Indies" in 1550 and dedicated it to Philip himself in

spite of the freedom with which it treated royal and feudal rights. Like the present Sovereign Pontiff, Las Casas retained his capacity for work, especially literary work, to the age of over ninety. He wrote the last chapters of his great History of the Indies in 1561 at eighty-seven, and three years later he published a monograph on Peru which shows all the energy and indefatigable investigation of his works written forty years earlier. His correspondence with every part of Spanish-America was enormous all through this time. Bishops and missionaries wrote to him from Peru, from Mexico, from Central America, the West Indies, Florida and other regions telling the wants of their people or the wrongdoing of officials. The redressing of these wrongs received his active care to the last and his death came in the discharge of a task for that Guatemala where he had established personally the first converted Indian province. The Supreme Court of Central America had been suppressed for motives of economy and the Bishop informed Las Casas that in consequence the poor, especially the Indians, found it impossible to get legal redress for the wrongs inflicted by the wealthy. Las Casas at ninety-two journeyed to Madrid, laid the case before the Ministry and pleaded it so effectually that the Court was restored. On his return to his convent he contracted a burning fever and passed away among his Dominican brethren in 1564.

There were many notable men among the first conquerors and settlers of America, but none more remarkable in every way than America's first Catholic priest, Bartolome de Las Casas.

Bryan J. Clinch.

San Francisco.

# THE LAST TEN YEARS OF THE TEMPORAL POWER.—FROM CASTELFIDARDO TO MENTANA.

1. Charles Garnier, Le Royaume des Deux Siciles. Paris, 1866.
2. L. A. de Becdelievre, Souvenirs d'Armé Pontificale. Paris, 1867.
3. Prof. Antonio Vitali, Ledieci giornate di Monte Rotondo. Roma, 1868.
4. Paolo Mencacci, La Mano di Dio nell' ultima invasion contro Roma. Roma, 1868.
5. Felice Carallotti, Storia dell-insurrezione di Roma nel 1867. Milano, 1869.
6. LeBaron de Mevius. Histoire de l' Invasion des Etats Pontificaux en 1867. Paris, 1875.
7. Paolo Mencacci, Memorie documentate per la Storia della Rivoluzione Italiana. Roma, 1879.
8. A. M. Bonetti, I Martiri Italiani, Storia dei Mezzi Morali della Rivoluzione Italiana. Modena, 1891.
9. The O'Clery, the Making of Italy. London, 1892.
10. René Bittard des Portes, Histoire des Zouaves Pontificaux. Paris, 1894.
11. Battles of the Nineteenth Century, published by Cassell & Co. London, 1895.

AFTER the defeat of the Papal army at Castelfidardo and the fall of Ancona, the conquest of the States of the Church went no further than the occupation of the provinces of the Marches and Umbria by the troops of Victor Emmanuel. It suited the vacillating policy of Napoleon III, who probably feared to irritate too violently the Catholic and conservative elements of the French nation, to uphold for some time longer the throne of the Holy Father, and the presence of a French garrison in Rome sufficed to stop the advance of the invaders and assure the independence of the territory known as the Patrimony of St. Peter, the poorest and most thinly inhabited portion of the Papal dominions. The Italian army was thus at liberty to hasten to assist Garibaldi in his Neapolitan campaign which, up to that moment, he was officially supposed to have undertaken against the will of Victor Emmanuel, and in spite of the efforts of Cavour to restrain him. And here, perhaps, it may be allowed to digress from the chief subject of this paper, and cast a glance at the condition of the Kingdom of Naples under that House of Bourbon which the Protestant Press of England and the atheistical press of the Continent have always conspired to revile and calumniate. The Bourbons, it is true, did not rule according to the forms of constitutional government so revered and cherished by Anglo-Saxon communities, but the same methods of administration are not necessarily adapted to all races. Among the easy-going and enterprising populations of Southern Europe, the government is expected to lead the way in all social movements, as well as in all industrial undertakings, and Ferdinand II, the father of Francis II, the sovereign whose rule Mr. Gladstone

so blindly and passionately denounced as the "negation of God," labored strenuously throughout his whole reign to promote in every way the interests and the welfare of his subjects.

To him is due the construction of the first railway opened in Italy; of the first suspension bridges made in Italy; of the first electric telegraph laid in Italy; of the first light-houses on the dioptric system raised on the coasts of Italy, and under his reign the first steamer built in Italy was launched from a Neapolitan dockyard. When Ferdinand II came to the throne in 1830, there were only 1,505 miles of road in his kingdom, only 64 miles of which had been made by the French revolutionists during their nine years occupation of the country, and by the end of 1855 he had opened 3,082 more; besides building many bridges, embanking torrents, and draining lagoons and marshes near Taranto, Brindisi, Nola, and Policastro. To Ferdinand II are due the military schools of Maddaloni and Gaeta; the veterinary and agricultural school of Naples, an academy for the navy, and naval schools at Procida and Gaeta, besides numerous colleges, orphanages, and hospitals in the principal cities of his States.[1] The reorganization of the Neapolitan Mint; the establishment of manufactories of arms and ammunition, and of the cannon foundry of Naples, are additional proofs of the activity and energy of a sovereign under whose rule trade and commerce flourished, the taxes were light, and the funds, a sure indication of the prosperity of a country, were always above par.

But the overthrow of the Bourbons had been resolved by the conspirators who were bent on uniting all Italy, whether under a monarchical or republican form of government, and to carry out their designs they recoiled from neither calumny nor treason. A single example of their shameless mendacity will suffice; the case, namely, of Baron Poerio, the political prisoner whose defence Mr. Gladstone took up with so much enthusiasm about 1852, making all Europe resound with the tale of his sufferings. Since then, a Radical deputy, Petruccelli della Gattina, has frankly confessed that when he and his fellow-conspirators were seeking to excite public opinion against the Bourbons, they selected Poerio as the embodiment of their hostility to that dynasty; the infidel press of France and England took up the question quite seriously; so did Gladstone, who exaggerated both the reputation of the prisoner and the nature of his punishment, and Poerio, the victim of Ferdinand II, was literally fabricated by means of newspaper articles at three half-pence a line.[2]

---

[1] Garnier. Le Royaume des Deux Siciles.

[2] Mencacci. Memorie documentate, vol. II., p. 162.

While the kingdom of Naples was in this thriving condition it was invaded by Victor Emmanuel, without a declaration of war, when the way had been opened for him by the filibustering expedition of Garibaldi, whose army before Capua, mostly composed of northern Italians, had already been strongly re-enforced by detachments of *bersaglieri* and artillery landed at Naples from Admiral Persano's fleet. It was on October 11, 1860, that Cialdini coming from Ancona led his troops across the frontier, and after defeating and capturing at Isernia, a small body of Neapolitan troops and armed peasants commanded by General Scotti, he shot in cold blood the peasants who had fallen into his hands, sparing only the soldiers. This act of cruelty was the beginning of the sanguinary atrocities which during the next four years desolated the provinces of the Abruzzi, the Capitanata, and Molise, where a very large proportion of the population still remained faithful to their king, and though treated as outlaws, offered a stubborn opposition to their annexation to Piedmont. From Isernia Cialdini marched to Gaeta, and began the siege rendered famous by the prolonged and gallant resistance of France II and his heroic Queen, leaving the suppression of the royalist guerrilla warfare to his lieutenants, among whom General Pinelli, Major Fumel, and de Ferrari, the prefect of Foggia, distinguished themselves by the ferocity of their proclamations and their acts. The first decreed in the month of November, 1860, that all unlicensed persons found with firearms, poignards or even knives in their possession, should be instantly shot, as well as those who excited the peasants to revolt, or who, by their deeds or their words, insulted the arms of Savoy, the portrait of the king, or the national flag. In Calabria, Major Fumel prohibited under pain of death not only to give food or shelter to a brigand, that is to say, to a royalist in arms, but even to carry bread out of a village. As in the province of Capitanata the royalist bands were generally mounted, the prefect de Ferrari decreed that the blacksmiths should only shoe horses at certain forges and in virtue of a special license; they were not to quit their village without a pass, nor even to have horses or tools for shoeing in their possession without leave from the authorities: any infraction of this law was to be considered as proof of complicity with the brigands.[8]

It was by this system of merciless repression that the Kingdom of Naples which, according to the Liberal press of Europe, was longing to be emancipated from the despotism of the Bourbons was annexed by the House of Savoy, and although the full details of

[8] Garnier. Le Royaume des Deux Siciles, pp. 180, 184, 190.

these atrocities will probably never be known, it has been estimated that the number of so-called brigands summarily executed amounted to 17,000,[4] and that up to November, 1862, no less than sixteen towns, situated in seven different provinces, with a total population of 49,366 souls, had been sacked and burned.[5]

Even Napoleon III, without whose connivance the invasion of the Papal States and consequently of the Kingdom of Naples could never have taken place, could not restrain his indignation on hearing by what methods was being established the unity of Italy, that cause for which he had squandered the gold and shed so lavishly the blood of France, and in a letter to General Fleury in July, 1862, he stated that he had written to Turin to express his horror at the cruelties of the Piedmontese generals, and he declared that the Bourbons had never been guilty of similar acts.[6]

While the rule of Victor Emmanuel was being thus brutally imposed on a people whom he was supposed to have come to enfranchise, the Papal Government, protected in its diminished territory from its exterior enemies by the presence of the French, was gradually reassembling and reorganizing the remains of its army. The Franco-Belgian battalion which had suffered such heavy losses at Castelfidardo was soon raised by the arrival of fresh recruits to the number of 600 men; on January 1st, 1861, its name was changed to that of Pontifical Zouaves and Major de Becdelièvre was raised to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. Towards the end of the same month the battalion was sent under his command to carry out a project devised by Mgr. de Mérode, the Minister of War, namely, the invasion of the province of Rieti and the re-establishment of the authority of the Papal Government. The surprise of the post which held the bridge at Passo di Correse, a village on the northern frontier of the province of Rome, was the only result of this expedition, for when, a few days later, the pontifical soldiers were advancing towards Rieti, they were stopped by a message from General de Goyou, the commander of the French troops in Rome, who undertook to hold the outposts along the limits of the Patrimony of St. Peter and prevent any aggression on the part of the Piedmontese. It was to be regretted that the General's solicitude for the safety of the territory confided to his care had not been aroused sooner, for in the same month of January, the Piedmontese general, de Sonnaz, who commanded a division at Sora in the Kingdom of Naples, crossed the Papal frontier in pursuit of a band of royalists composed of Neapolitan soldiers and armed peasants

[4] Bonetti. part II., p. 5.
[5] O'Clery. p. 305.
[6] Garnier. p. 181.

under the command of a Swiss officer, Count de Christen, seized the monastery of Casamari, plundered both it and the church and set it on fire.[7] It was this general who in the previous month of September had taken Perugia, and who, on the following day, had tried by court-martial and condemned to death the Rev. Baldassare Santi, falsely accused of having fired on the Piedmontese and killed a soldier. It was in vain that the Bishop of Perugia, Cardinal Pecci, now His Holiness Pope Leo XIII, and the principal citizens of the town interceded for the unfortunate priest, and bore witness to his piety, his charity, and his virtuous life. The sentence was executed within twenty-four hours, but a few days later the falsity of the denunciation and the innocence of the victim were fully recognized.[8]

General de Sonnaz crossed the frontier again with several thousand men soon after his sacrilegious aggression on Casamari, and attacked Bauco, a village surrounded by a mediaeval wall and standing on the summit of a steep hill, where Count de Christen had taken refuge with his band. The general bombarded the village for some hours, and then sent his troops twice to the assault; they were repulsed on each occasion with a total loss of 500 killed and wounded, and the position seemed impregnable; yet the general's pride forbade him to withdraw from before a mere village defended by irregulars while he feared that the arrival of French or Papal troops might compel him to make an ignominious retreat. He therefore offered to allow the band which had nearly exhausted its ammunition to retire without being pursued, promising to return to his side of the frontier, on condition that Count de Christen should give his word to refrain from further hostilities.[9]

Nevertheless the Piedmontese government continued to show its contempt for the principles of international law by allowing the troops to make frequent incursions into the Papal territory, though sometimes the invaders were made to pay dearly for their aggression. Thus on July 28, 1862, a patrol of seventeen Pontifical zouaves, led by Lieutenant Mousty, surprised a body of 200 *bersaglieri* who had entered the territory of the Church near Ceprano in pursuit of a body of Neapolitan royalists, and by their sudden onslaught drove them back across the frontier in disorder and with heavy losses. The village was immediately occupied by a detachment of French troops in order to guard against any future attacks, but the *Civiltá Cattolica* asserts that between December 31, 1864, and July 1, 1865, Piedmontese patrols crossed the limits of the Papal states no less than eight times and usually for the purpose of arresting

[7] O'Clery p. 246. Bonetti. Martiri Italiani, part 1.
[8] Bonetti, part II, p. 36. O'Clery, p. 248.

Papal subjects accused of brigandage, though the General in command of the French army of occupation never failed to protest against these violations of international law.[10]

In the meanwhile the adherents of Mazzini and Garibaldi were not idle, but continued to agitate and conspire to bring about the annexation of Rome and Venice. An expedition which was organized in the month of May, 1862, to invade the Venetian provinces, seems to have been at first connived at, if not, indeed, encouraged by the Italian Government, and it was not till the last moment that Rattazzi, then prime minister, thought fit to arrest the leaders. In the month of August of the same year Garibaldi put himself at the head of a similar movement with the openly avowed intention of marching upon Rome. The facility with which he was allowed to organize an army of about 3,000 men in Sicily, made him apparently believe that Rattazzi would allow him to prepare the way to Rome for him as he had prepared the way to Naples for Cavour; and, indeed, the feeble opposition he met with from the Piedmontese generals in Sicily, and from Admiral Albini at Catania, must have encouraged him in that belief, as he sailed from Catania on August 24, with 2,000 volunteers, and landed in Calabria the next morning. But to attack Rome was a far more serious matter than to invade the But to attack Romewas a far more serious matter than to invade the kingdom of Naples, and the determination manifested by France to defend what remained of the Papal territory must have made the Italian government understand that the treacherous policy of Cavour which had caused the downfall of Francis II would, in this case, have no chance of success. Energetic measures were therefore immediately taken to stop the march of the general, who had thrown himself with his band among the dense woods and the intricate ravines of the mountainous region known as Aspromonte which forms the southernmost extremity of Italy, and Colonel Pallavicini was sent from Reggio with several battalions of *bersaglieri* to arrest him, or even, according to General Cialdini's words, to destroy him, if he attempted to resist.[11] The royal troops met the Garibaldians on the 29th of August, and, though Garibaldi had ordered his volunteers not to fire, a skirmish took place in which some fifty men were killed and wounded, and, among the latter, Garibaldi himself. The General was brought as a prisoner to the fort of Varignano, near La Spezzia, but after an imprisonment of a little over a month, he and his followers were set at liberty.

The resolution, however, of the ministers of Victor Emmanuel

[9] Civilta Cattolica. series 6, vol. iv, p. 487.

[10] O'Clery. p. 331.

to annex Rome was not in any way diminished because they had been obliged to repress the indiscreet ardor of a too zealous instrument: they sought, therefore, to obtain by diplomatic methods the victory which it was impossible to achieve by force as long as the French troops guarded any portion of the States of the Church, and they began to negotiate with the Court of the Tuileries with the object of inducing the Emperor to put an end to the occupation on condition that the independence of the Holy See should be recognized. Their first overtures were firmly rejected by M. Drouyn de Lhuys, but in June, 1864, he informed them that his government was willing to discuss the question, and after secret negotiations conducted between the Emperor, the Italian Ambassador Cavaliere Nigra, and the Marchese Pepoli, a special envoy, but without the intervention of Pius IX, who was not even consulted on the occasion, a convention was signed on the 15th of September, 1864, which, under the fallacious appearance of a guarantee for the independence of the Holy Father, prepared the way for the final abolition of his temporal power.

According to this agreement, the Italian Government pledged itself not to attack the territory still remaining to the Church and to hinder by force any attempt at an invasion: it promised not to protest against the organization of a Papal army even though composed of foreigners, sufficient to maintain order in the Papal States and on their frontiers, provided it did not become a means of aggression against Italy; and it consented to take upon itself a proportional part of the debt of the former States of the Church. The French Government on the other hand, agreed to withdraw its troops gradually, according as the Papal army was increased, and to complete the evacuation within two years. By a secret protocol annexed to the Convention it was stipulated that it was to become executive after the publication of a decree transferring the capital of Italy from Turin to Florence, and that this transfer was to take place within six months of the date of the Convention.

No one, however, was deceived by the guarantees contained in this document: the unprovoked invasions without declaration of war of the States of the Church and of the kingdom of Naples had shown the methods by which the Italian Government intended to carry out its resolution to unite all the Peninsula under the Crown of Savoy: and if any doubt remained on the subject, the outspoken declarations of the Italian press, of the Italian ministry, and even of the diplomatists who had drawn up the Convention, would have manifested its utter worthlessness as a safeguard for the Temporal Power. They all agreed in asserting that no intention of abandon-

ing the aspirations of the nation had been expressed in this document, that it severed the last link of the chain which bound France to their enemies; and even M. Drouyn de Lhuys observed that the possibility of a revolution bursting out spontaneously in Rome had not been foreseen by the Convention. He added, it is true, that in case such an event took place, France reserved her liberty of action, but the successors of Cavour knew very well how easily spontaneous revolutions could be brought about. They nearly succeeded in causing one against themselves, for the first result of the publication of the Convention was to excite an intense irritation among the people of Turin, when suddenly informed of the approaching transfer of the capital to Florence. The turbulent demonstrations of anger to which this irritation gave rise were suppressed with a ferocity and an amount of bloodshed unknown under the much caluminated governments of Pius IX and Francis II, and the immediate dismissal of the ministry alone saved Turin from civil war.

In view, therefore, of the approaching departure of the French army of occupation, it became necessary to take steps for the reorganization and increase of the small army on which the Holy Father would thenceforth have to rely for the defence of the diminished territory of the Church. General de La Moriciére who, though still retaining the title of commander-in-chief, had lived since the capitulation of Ancona at his country house in France, died suddenly on the 10th of September, 1865, and in the month of October following, General Kanzler, who had distinguished himself at the combat of San Angelo during the campaign of 1860, was promoted to the supreme command of the Papal army, and became Minister of War in the place of Mgr. de Mérode. About the same time was formed a regiment named from the town, where it was enrolled, *La Légion d'Antibes.* It was composed of French officers and soldiers authorized by the Emperor to enter the service of the Holy See but who still retained their French nationality and their respective ranks in the French army. Major de Becdelièvre, who had formed the battalion of Pontifical Zouaves and had led it at Castelfidardo, had resigned his command in 1861 in consequence of a misunderstanding with Mgr. de Mérode, and had been succeeded by Colonel Allet, a Swiss officer and one of those who had been longest in the service of the Holy Father. During the following years, the Zouaves, like the rest of the Papal troops, had been scattered in small detachments among the villages situated along the Neapolitan frontier, and were unceasingly engaged in pursuing the bands of brigands which infested that mountainous region. These

marauders had then lost all political significance; they were no longer recruited from the partisans of the Bourbons, fighting for their king and the independence of their country, but were merely gatherings of outlaws and desperadoes such as has for centuries formed the usual elements of Italian brigandage.[12] After the departure of the French troops who embarked at Civitá Vecchia on December 11, 1866, the Zouaves began to receive numerous accessions from all parts of Europe; a large number of these recruits bore the names of the most illustrious houses of France where the aristocracy principally distinguished itself by its devotion to the Holy Father; those still more numerous, from Belgium and Holland, who formed about two-thirds of the entire regiment, came generally from the peasantry. Ireland, which in 1860 had sent a contingent of 1,200 men to the army of La Moricière, was now represented in the regiment of Zouaves by Captain d'Arcy and Captain Delahoyd, who had served in the battalion of St. Patrick, by Surgeon-Major O'Flynn who had taken part in the defence of Spoleto under Major O'Reilly, and by several recruits who hastened to join the Papal standard when the Garibaldian invasion began.

By October 1, 1867, the Papal army amounted to nearly 13,000 men; 8,415 of whom were Papal subjects, and many of them from the provinces which had been annexed by the Kingdom of Italy. The foreign element was represented by 2,237 Zouaves, 1,233 Swiss carabineers and 1,096 French serving in the *Légion d'Antibes*. The effective force, however, capable of taking the field, did not amount to more than 8,000 men, but these were far better organized and disciplined than those whom La Moricière had commanded in 1860, and they were animated with a spirit of loyalty and devotion to the cause of the Holy Father which amply compensated for their deficiency in numbers.

In the spring and summer of 1867 Garibaldi visited the chief cities of North Italy with the openly avowed intention of enrolling volunteers for an invasion of the Papal States, proclaiming everywhere the necessity of abolishing the Temporal Power, and boasting that he would seize Rome in spite of the protection of France and the vigilance of the Italian troops which guarded the frontiers. In answer to his appeal a small band commanded by Galliano of Genoa, a former Garibaldian officer, left Terni in the month of June and advanced as far as Monte Rotondo, but fled on the arrival of a detachment of Papal troops.[13] This expedition was blamed and

[12] G. Galtiano, Spedizione di Terni, p. 8. 17.
[11] Bittard des Portes p. 69. O'Clery, p. 3

disavowed both by the Italian ministry and by Garibaldi, probably because it was unsuccessful, but it served to reveal the approaching danger to the Papal Government and to put it on its guard. Rattazzi, who was then prime minister, had a different game to play. He wished to make use of Garibaldi for the purpose of exciting in the Papal States a revolutionary movement which would serve as a pretext for the entrance of the Italian army, while on the other hand he could not afford to quarrel with the Emperor who seemed determined to maintain the independence of the Holy See, and who insisted that the Papal frontier should be carefully watched and the Convention of September faithfully observed. Rattazzi, indeed, gave repeated assurances of his respect for the Convention and of the care with which he sought to carry out its stipulations; he even affected to believe that Garibaldi had changed his mind, that he had abandoned his projected expeditions and was about to return to Caprera,[14] though, meanwhile, crowds of volunteers were allowed to assemble in the towns and villages of Tuscany and prepare for the invasion of the Papal territory. On September 16th Garibaldi issued an inflammatory proclamation calling on the Romans to rise, and Rattazzi foreseeing the imminent danger of another French intervention and probably a war with France, ordered Garibaldi and his staff to be arrested at Sinalunga near Arezzo on September 23d. The General was brought to the fortress of Alexandria in Lombardy, but, after a few days, Rattazzi, intimidated by the noisy demonstrations and the menaces of the advanced Radicals, allowed him to return to his home on the Island of Caprera, without exacting any conditions or promise, but to prevent his escape, the island was watched by two cruisers and after a short time their number was increased to seven.

The arrest of its leader did not stop the Garibaldian expedition. According to the General's orders the bands which formed the right wing of his forces, commanded by General Acerbi, were to advance from Orvieto towards Viterbo; those of the centre, under Menotti Garibaldi, from Terni towards Monte Rotondo and Tivoli, and those of the left wing under Nicotera, were to enter from the Kingdom of Naples and march towards Velletri. By this skilfully devised plan of campaign Garibaldi hoped that if the Papal troops were dispersed in various directions to guard the frontier against simultaneous invasions at widely distant points, the people of Rome would be free to rise, while if they remained on the defensive in Rome, the three divisions of his army would unite and attack the city.[15] Their numbers alone would have rendered them formidable, for no less than 30,000 men are said to have been enrolled.

[13] Mevius, p. 101.

[14] Cavallotti. p. 317.

The first band of volunteers comprising somewhat over 20 men crossed the frontier coming from Orvieto on the evening of September 28th. Galliano of Genoa was again their leader and the next day he surprised a small post of gendarmes at Grotte San Stefano; the villages of Bomarzo, Soriano, and Caprarola, also held by a few gendarmes, were taken in the course of the following days; but the band, which had been increased by fresh arrivals to the number of 60 men, was defeated near Ronciglione by a company of the line and a detachment of gendarmes, and forced to retreat to Bagnorea. Other bands apparently acting independently of each other entered the northern portion of the Papal territory about the same time coming from different directions; one was beaten at Canino, not far from Viterbo; others at Ischia and Valentano close to the Tuscan frontier; another of over 300 men led by Count Pagliacci, an officer of Acerbi's staff, took Acquapendente after a vigorous resistance from the garrison of 27 gendarmes, but it was surprised a few days later at the neighboring village of San Lorenzo by Colonel Azzanesi, the military governor of the province, and defeated with the loss of many prisoners.

The first serious resistance by the Papal troops was at Bagnorea, a walled village to the north of Viterbo, strongly situated on the summit of a steep hill and accessible only by a single road passing over a bridge. As the town was not held by a garrison a Garibaldian band seized it on October 1st, sacked the Churches, broke the images of the saints, insulted and ill-treated the clergy, took possession of the municipal treasury and proclaimed the dictatorship of Garibaldi.[16] The arrival of other bands soon raised their numbers to 500; and they proceeded to strengthen the defences of the town; they loopholed the walls of the houses which commanded the bridge, fortified the convent of San Francesco outside the gates and raised barricades on the roads. They were thus able to repulse a reconnaissance made by a detachment of 20 Zouaves, 4 gendarmes and 45 soldiers of the line which succeeded in storming one of the barracks and killing many of its defenders, but was obliged to retire before the heavy fire from the houses, and with the loss of some prisoners. The triumph of the Garibaldians did not last long. On October 5th Colonel Azzanesi marched from Montefiascone with two companies of Zouaves commanded by Captain Le Gonidec, and four companies of the line under Captain Zanetti, together with a few dragoons and two guns, in all about 460 men; and after a sharp combat drove the Garibaldians from their barri-

[15] Mencacci, vol. 1, p. 35.

cades into the town, and took the convent at the point of the bayonet. The artillery then came into action; after a few discharges the Garibaldians fled through the ravines surrounding the town and the citizens flinging open their gates welcomed their liberators. This victory cost the Papal troops only six wounded, while the Garibaldians lost 96 killed and wounded and 110 prisoners.

In spite of these reverses the invasion continued and band after band entered the Papal States at many points, hastening back when defeated to take refuge on the Italian side of the frontier. Victor Emmanuel's troops, which were supposed to guard the frontier, rarely made any attempt to arrest the volunteers who arrived in crowds at Perugia, Orvieto and Terni, mostly provided with free passes over the railways, and were allowed to receive arms and ammunition from the National Guards of the adjacent villages. It would be tedious to enter into the details of the many skirmishes which took place every day; from that where Menotti Garibaldi was defeated near Monte Libretti in the north, to Subiaco in the east, where the Garibaldian leader, Major Blenio, was killed, and to Vallecorsa in the south where Nicotera's Neapolitan volunteers were beaten and dispersed after having plundered the village of Falvaterra, but the attack on Monte Libretti on October 13th is more worthy of notice.

The band of Menotti Garibaldi which had been defeated and driven across the frontier on October 6th, shortly after it had invaded the Papal territory, had returned in much greater strength, and occupied Monte Libretti, a walled village built around a castle of the middle ages, on the summit of a steep and isolated hill. At the foot of the hill a bridge crosses a deep ravine, and from the gate of the town a street leads to it commanded on one side by the walls of the castle. Menotti Garibaldi was known to be advancing towards the village and Lieut.-Col. de Charette had ordered three detachments to march from different points to intercept him. One of these columns had already been sent in a different direction and did not receive the counter-order; another came too soon to the point where the three were to meet and after waiting some time withdrew; the third column composed of 90 Zouaves under Lieutenant Guillemin, on arriving near Monte Libretti about six in the evening, surprised the Garibaldian advanced posts, and attacking them at once drove them back into the town. Guillemin then sent a section of his men under Sub-Lieutenant de Quélen to turn the enemy's position, and at the head of the others dashed forward through the vineyards which covered the approaches, and on through the narrow street, under a heavy fire from the windows of the castle,

to the open space before the gate which was filled with Garibaldians. Here he fell with a bullet through the brain, and a furious hand to hand fight ensued between the small body of Zouaves and their far more numerous opponents. Major Fazzari, a Garibaldian officer, was wounded and made prisoner; Corporal Alfred Collingridge, of London, fought desperately, hemmed in by six Garibaldians, till he was mortally wounded, and Peter Yong, a tall and athletic Dutchman, killed sixteen Garibaldians with his clubbed rifle, then sank down exhausted with fatigue, and was immediately bayoneted. When the fight had lasted for about a quarter of an hour the section of de Quélen came up, and drove the Garibaldians into the town, but de Quélen fell mortally wounded, and though the Zouaves made three attempts to pass the gate, their efforts failed before the shower of bullets directed upon it from all sides, and the Garibaldians closed and barricaded the door. Seventeen Zouaves had been killed and eighteen wounded, and night having fallen a part of the survivors retreated to the village of Monte Maggiore, but Sergeant-Major Bach, a Bavarian, who, along with some Zouaves had been separated from the others in the darkness, took possession of a house near the gate, and continued to exchange shots with the enemy till dawn next morning, when he too withdrew to Monte Maggiore, while Menotti, who had no less than 1,200 men, believing that this handful of Zouaves were the advanced guard of a larger force, retreated in the opposite direction to Nerola.

Like Monte Libretti, Nerola is a walled village situated on the summit of a steep hill and defended by a strongly built castle, impregnable except with the help of artillery, and the approaches had been fortified by barricades. Lieut.-Col. de Charette received orders to dislodge Menotti Garibaldi from this formidable position, and he marched from Monte Rotondo with one gun and about 900 infantry drawn from the Zouaves, the *Légion d'Antibes* and the Swiss carabineers. He arrived before Nerola on the morning of the 18th and found that Menotti Garibaldi had withdrawn to a position nearer to the frontier leaving 200 men to defend the village. The Garibaldians were soon driven back into the castle from which they maintained a heavy fire for some time, till finding that the gate was on the point of being blown open and that there was no hope of assistance from Menotti, they laid down their arms.

On the same day another victory was achieved by the Papal soldiers near the village of Farnese, on the Tuscan frontier, where after a sharp combat, in which Lieutenant de Fournel was killed, a small body of Zouaves, gendarmes, and chasseurs, in all 110 men, drove a numerous band of Garibaldians from their advanced post

in a farmhouse and afterwards from the village of Farnese; but the Garibaldians who had lost heavily, and were rendered furious by their defeat, murdered two Capuchin fathers in a neighboring monastery.

After taking Nerola, Colonel de Charette had intended to pursue Menotti Garibaldi, break up his band and drive him across the frontier, but a dispatch from General Kanzler recalled him to Rome where it was found necessary to concentrate the scattered detachments of the Papal army. It was not merely against the incursions of armed bands that the Papal Government had to guard; it was well aware of the presence in Rome of Garibaldian emissaries actively engaged in preparing an insurrection which would afford a pretext for the intervention of the Italian troops and the occupation of Rome, and it saw the importance of taking every precaution to assure the tranquility of the Eternal City and the safety of the Holy Father. The city was therefore declared to be in a state of siege; the bridges over the Aniene were mined; most of the gates were closed and barricaded; earthworks armed with guns were thrown up outside those left open; artillery was placed in position on Mount Aventine and the ditches of the castle of St. Angelo were filled with water. Even the two companies of recruits in the *dépôt* at San Callisto were called on to share the duties of the garrison, and remained under arms for the greater part of each night in readiness for any emergency.

In spite of the vigilance of the police there were at that time in Rome, three secret committees actively engaged in conspiring against the authority of Pius IX, but their efforts to overthrow his government were happily counteracted to a great extent by their mutual jealousies and their incessant disputes. The origin of these committees may be assigned to the revolution of 1848, for the last act of Mazzini and his fellow triumvirs before leaving Rome on the entrance of the French troops in July, 1849, was to found a secret society under the title of *il Comitato Centrale* for the purpose of spreading republican principles among the people, and fostering a spirit of hostility towards the rulers of Italy, and more especially towards the Sovereign Pontiff.[17] As dissensions soon broke out in this committee, Mazzini dissolved it and instituted another, *la Direzione Centrale interna*, the special object of which was to make ready for a general insurrection throughout Italy, and which did, in fact, cause a rising in Milan in February, 1853. This outbreak was quickly suppressed by the Austrian troops, and its failure, by

[16] Cavallotti, p. 29.

manifesting the incapacity of Mazzini, weakened his authority among his followers and produced an irritation against him which split up *la Direzione* into two factions; the *puri* or thorough-going republicans, who remained faithful to their leader's ideal of an Italian republic, and the *fusionisti* who aimed at uniting all shades of opinion under the constitutional government of the House of Savoy. This latter section founded in Rome in 1853 the *Comitato Nazionale* which soon brought under its influence many citizens whose opinions were liberal but who were averse to violence, and in return for the services it rendered to the liberal party it received from the Piedmontese ministry a monthly subsidy of 5,000 francs.[18]

The temporising policy of the *Comitato Nazionale* which deprecated and hindered any attempt at an insurrection in Rome, and hoped to achieve the unity of Italy solely by diplomacy and through the intervention of Piedmont, seemed contemptible to the more enthusiastic members of the revolutionary party. They derided the childish manifestations by which the *Comitato* sought to remind the public of its existence and annoy the police without incurring any danger; such as exploding noisy but harmless fireworks, burning tri-colored lights in public places, or letting loose dogs with tri-colored cockades tied to their tails, and in 1861 they founded the *Comitato d'azione*, which printed secretly a newspaper entitled *Roma o Morte*, entered into correspondence with Garibaldi and made preparations for a revolt. Garibaldi's defeat at Aspromonte put an end to this project, and several of the conspirators were arrested to the great relief of the more cautious committee which was even accused of having aided the Roman police in its investigations, and of having taken advantage of the misfortune which had befallen its fellow-conspirators, to steal their clandestine printing-press.[19] Three years later, when the departure of the French troops seemed to present a favorable opportunity for a rising, the *Comitato d'azione* was again established, and to hasten on still more the revolutionary movement, it was soon followed by a third Committee named *il Centro d'insurrezione*. The *Comitato Nazionale*, always hostile to the idea of a revolt, issued in vain protestations and warnings against the dangerous tendencies of its new rival; it was rapidly losing its influence and the subsidy it received from Piedmont, which Baron Ricasoli, when prime minister, had raised to 10,000 francs a month, was withdrawn in 1867 by his successor Urbano Rattazzi. Some of the members of the discredited *Comitato* then resigned, and forming a coalition with the *Centro d'insurrezione*, founded in July, 1867, a

[17] Cavallotti, pp. 40, 164.

[18] Cavallotti, p. 41.

new Committee, which under the name of the *Giunta Nazionale Romana* took upon itself from thenceforward the direction of the conspiracy. The insurgents were mostly composed of Garibaldians from different parts of Italy who had entered Rome secretly, and remained there in hiding; their principal leaders were Colonel Francesco Cucchi, of Bergamo, who held the supreme command, and Guerzoni, a member of the Italian parliament, who acted as his lieutenant; but only a small proportion of the Roman people belonging, almost without exception, to the dregs of the populace, took part in the rising.[20]

The long expected insurrection, which was intended to serve as a pretext for the intervention of the Italian troops, began on the evening of October 22d, in several parts of Rome simultaneously, but it was speedily suppressed before any serious injury had been caused, with the exception of the destruction of the Serristori barracks not far from St. Peter's. The conspirators had planned to undermine and blow up all the barracks in Rome; among others, those of the Swiss Guard in the Vatican, and even the powder magazine of the Castle of St. Angelo;[21] but Rattazzi ordered Colonel Cucchi to change the date of the rising from the 27th, which had been originally fixed, to the 22d before all was ready, and his impatience saved the city from ruin. At the Serristori barracks two barrels of powder had been deposited in a workshop on the ground floor and when, at 7 o'clock, the mine was fired, a large portion of the building sank in ruins, crushing in its fall thirty-four Zouaves, nineteen of whom were Italians, mostly bandsmen. The loss of life would have been far greater had not the company quartered in the barracks been sent some hours previously to seize a store of arms and ammunition concealed in a villa three miles beyond the Porta San Paolo. At the same time a band of Garibaldians commanded by Guerzoni, surprised and disarmed after a short resistance, the corporal's guard at the Porta San Paolo, intending to bring in the arms and ammunition which they did not know had been already discovered and carried off, and Cucchi led other detachments to the attack of the Capitol. There the guard held its ground, and being quickly re-enforced, the Garibaldians were repulsed with loss, while Guerzoni and his band were soon after driven from the post which they had taken and where they had raised a barricade. Attempts were also made by other bodies of insurgents to seize the gas works and the military hospital, and some soldiers returning alone to their barracks were set upon and murdered, but by midnight the Gari-

[19] Mencacci, vol. II, p. 28.

[20] Mevius, p. 212.

baldians had been everywhere beaten and dispersed, and the 3,500,000 francs which the Italian Government had given to organise this revolt, as was proved in the following year at the trial of Monti and Tognetti, the assassins who had blown up the Serristori barracks, had been spent in vain.[22]

The absence of an important reinforcement which, happily for Rome, failed to arrive in time, contributed not a little to this speedy suppression of the insurrection. Two Garibaldian officers, Enrico and Giovanni Cairoli, the latter a captain in the Italian army, had promised to introduce a convoy of arms into Rome, and, accompanied by 74 volunteers, all picked men, they descended the Tiber, and before dawn on the 23d they were about two miles from Rome, at the spot where the Aniene falls into the Tiber, where they seized a boat with some custom house officers on guard. Not meeting, however, with the guide they expected, they hid themselves in a villa surrounded by a vineyard situated on the Monte Parioli, which rises abruptly from the banks of the Tiber. They were not discovered till the afternoon, and at dusk they were attacked by a company of Swiss Carabineers. A desperate fight ensued, in which Enrico Cairoli was killed, and his brother and seven others wounded, the remainder of the band escaped, helped by the darkness and recrossed the frontier.

Rome was not yet, however, quite out of danger. It was only on the morning of the 25th that the police discovered the existence of another *dépôt* of arms, ammunition and Orsini bombs concealed in the Trastevere, in a cloth manufactory, an isolated building of great extent and strongly barricaded. A large number of Garibaldians amounting to 80 or 100 and mostly from outside Rome, were assembled there and intended to make another attempt to excite a revolt. That afternoon the house was attacked by the Zouaves of the 1st company of the *dépôt* and some gendarmes; the doors were broken open and the Garibaldians who made a determined resistance were driven from one part of the building to another, losing 16 killed and 30 wounded; till the survivors laid down their arms.

Though the Papal troops had already begun to return to Rome they still held Viterbo where Colonel Azzanesi had a small garrison of about 400 men, mostly Italian soldiers of the line, with 52 Zouaves, 50 gendarmes, a few dragoons and two guns. He was attacked on the night of the 25th by a band of 1,500 volunteers led by General Acerbi, the commander of the right wing of the Gari-

[21] Mevius, p. 201.

baldian forces, who, until then, had remained in the strong position of Torre-Alfina, organizing and drilling his men, and who had been given to understand that the citizens of Viterbo were ready to rise against the Papal garrison. The combat lasted the greater part of the night, the Garibaldians succeeded in setting fire to one of the gates, and advanced to the assault, driving before them as a screen, the monks whom they had dragged from two neighboring monasteries, but their repeated efforts to force an entrance were repulsed each time, and as, in spite of the promises of the revolutionary committee of Viterbo, the citizens showed no intention of rising, Acerbi withdrew his men, many of whom were made prisoners next day during their retreat.

Meanwhile Garibaldi who on the 2d of October had already made an attempt to escape from Caprera but had been stopped and brought back by one of the cruisers, succeeded in leaving the island in a canoe on the night of the 13th. On the coast of Sardinia a fishing boat provided by his friends was in readiness for him, and on the 19th he landed near Leghorn. On the 21st he was in Florence, where Rattazzi, who had just given in his resignation, refused to take on himself the responsibility of ordering his arrest, and so did General Cialdini, the new minister, who had not yet formed his cabinet.[22] At last, at the request of the French ambassador, the King himself directed Rattazzi to seize Garibaldi, who, after addressing the people from the window of the house of his friend Crispi, had left for the frontier by special train. Rattazzi's telegram to the prefect of Perugia ordered him to pursue the General, but so as not to overtake him, and Garibaldi, crossing the frontier at Correse on the evening of the 23d, took the command of the bands which had been assembled there from all directions, and which formed an army of at least 10,000 men, divided into 22 battalions. The majority of these were drawn from the populace of the cities of Northern Italy, their own leaders spoke of them with the utmost contempt,[23] and their conduct in every town or village which they took showed that they were attracted mainly by the hope of plunder, but there were also among them many soldiers and officers of the regular army who had been given leave of absence, and many veterans who had fought under Garibaldi in his previous campaigns.

The road from Correse to Rome passes through Monte Rotondo, a small town situated on a height. Only one-third of its circuit is protected by a wall, in which are three gates, the remainder has no other defence than the houses and gardens which line the brow of

---

[22] Mevius, p. 192.

[23] Mevius, p. 298.

the hill. Near the centre is the palace of the Prince of Piombino, a massive building of three stories from which rises a tall tower. Colonel de Charette when retreating on Rome had left in the town as garrison under the command of Captain Costes of the *Légion d'Antibes*, two companies of that regiment, one of Swiss rifles, some gendarmes, dragoons and artillerymen, in all 323 men with two guns. At daybreak on the 25th the Garibaldians were seen advancing in three strong columns and taking up their positions round the town; they were under the command of Menotti Garibaldi, while his father remained in the rear with the reserves. Captain Costes, who had received orders to defend the town as long as possible, posted his small garrison at the gates and in the houses on the outskirts of the town so as to command every approach, and when, at 6 o'clock, the attack began, the Garibaldians were everywhere received with such a heavy fire, that though frequently rallied by their officers, they were finally repulsed after three hours of continuous fighting. Garibaldi then brought up fresh troops, took the command in person, and recommenced the attack on all sides, but in vain: his volunteers were repeatedly driven back both from the gates and from the open part of the town by the well directed fire of the Papal troops, especially the Swiss rifles, and after a combat of eight hours they gradually withdrew wearied and discouraged.

Garibaldi had not expected this obstinate resistance; he had hoped to have stormed the town in a few minutes and then, by making a forced march, to have taken Rome by surprise. He gave orders, therefore, to renew the attack that night, and about 9 o'clock a cart laden with faggots and bags of sulphur was rolled up against one of the gates by a party of volunteers who lost heavily on the occasion, and set on fire. The gate was soon enveloped in flames, but whilst it was burning, Captain Costes raised barricades in the streets leading from it, and when the gate fell and the Garibaldians rushed into the town it was only after two hours of desperate fighting that the Papal troops, yielding to superior numbers, were driven back into the Palace. The combat began again with the return of daylight; the Garibaldians had occupied the surrounding houses, and from the roofs and windows fired upon the Palace, till at 9 o'clock, when Captain Costes, finding that the building was being undermined, and seeing no hope of help from Rome, was obliged to capitulate after a resistance of 27 hours, during which the loss of the garrison had been only 4 killed and 20 wounded, while the Garibaldians, as their leader stated, had lost 500 killed and wounded, though the number is known to have been much greater. It is but just to add that the prisoners were treated with courtesy by Gari-

baldi and his two sons who protected them against the brutality of their undisciplined followers: they were brought to Correse and handed over to the Italian troops guarding the frontier, whence they were brought to La Spezia and kept there till the end of the campaign. The Garibaldians were, however, allowed to plunder and desecrate the Churches of the town and the monasteries outside it, to ill-treat the clergy, to smash the crucifixes and the images of the saints, and to carry away the sacred vessels.[25]

Up to this time the indecision of the Emperor of the French and the uncertainty as to what line of policy he would ultimately adopt had caused the government of the Holy Father much uneasiness; it seemed as though he were anxious to allow the Italian troops following in the track of Garibaldi to occupy Rome, and then accept the downfall of the Temporal Power, as an accomplished fact never more to be discussed. On the 16th of October Napoleon III had, indeed, declared his intention of upholding the throne of Pius IX, and orders had been given to embark troops at Toulon but the negotiations with Italy still continued, and when Rattazzi who, it is assured, had made overtures to Prussia for the formation of a defensive and offensive alliance against France,[26] gave in his resignation on the evening of October 9th, the Emperor seemed to take it for granted that the complicity of the Italian Government with Garibaldi was at an end, he countermanded the departure of the expedition and the troops were again landed. As, however, General Cialdini who was called upon to succeed Rattazzi was unable to find colleagues who were willing to execute the stipulations of the Convention of the 15th of September, the Emperor once more ordered the expedition to start. Even then he showed irresolution, for the fleet was again stopped when on the point of leaving, and it was only on the evening of the 26th that it sailed from Toulon.

Garibaldi was detained at Monte Rotondo till the 27th by the necessity of reorganising his troops after their heavy losses, and on the evening of that day he marched with his whole army to Fornonuovo, about 8 miles from Rome, but did not advance again till the 29th when he found that the Ponte Salaro, one of the three bridges over the Aniene had been blown up, and that the other two were strongly guarded, and he withdrew. On the 30th he again advanced, intending to seize the Ponte Nomentano, but his battalions were stopped by the troops which guarded the bridge, and after skirmishing all day without making a serious attack he drew off his men at night-fall and retreated to Monte Rotondo. He had

[24] Vitali, pp. 30, 43, 97.

[25] Mevius, p. 187.

been already apprised of the landing of the French expedition at Civita Vecchia and that afternoon their first brigade entered Rome, while by order of Victor Emmanuel the Italian troops crossed the frontier and occupied the towns which had been taken by the Garibaldians.

Although many volunteers, disheartened and irritated by the retreat from the very gates of Rome, had thrown away their arms and deserted, fresh bands of volunteers continued to arrive and Garibaldi still hoped to prolong the struggle. He at first intended to fortify Monte Rotondo and await there the attack of the Papal army; considering, however, that Tivoli situated on the slopes of the Sabine hills with a river in front and the mountainous district of the Abruzzi in the rear was a much stronger position, after much hesitation and many changes of plans, he gave orders to his son Menotti to march for that town at dawn on the 3d of November, but his departure was delayed till 11 by the necessity of distributing shoes and clothing to his followers. According to the most trustworthy calculations he had still at that moment at the very least 10,000 men.[27]

The army which General Kanzler led out from Rome that morning was divided into two columns: the first composed exclusively of Papal troops and commanded by General de Courten, reckoned 2,913 men, 1,500 of whom were Zouaves; in the second column were a little more than 2,000 of the French soldiers under the order of General de Polhés, in all about 5,000 men with ten guns. The troops were called to arms at one o'clock, but it was already four when the Papal forces marched out of the Porta Pia, followed at a short distance by the French contingent. The morning was rainy and dark, the soldiers in heavy marching order and carrying two days rations, advanced slowly over the muddy road. After crossing the Ponte Nomentano, about three miles from Rome, General Kanzler sent Major de Troussures with three companies of the 2d battalion of Zouaves by a road to the left towards the valley of the Tiber, there to march on a parallel to that followed by the main body, so as to turn the right flank of the Garibaldians. The remainder of the column then went on though mud and rain till it reached the farm of Capobianco halfway on the road to Mentana, where it halted to let the men get some food, and dry their clothes; and when, after an hour's rest, they had again formed their ranks and resumed their march, the rain had ceased and the sun shone out brightly in a cloudless sky.

On leaving Capobianco the road gradually ascends towards a

[27] Mevius, p. 365.

more elevated region of the Campagna and then winds along the lower slopes of several hills covered with brushwood, till near Mentana, where it is commanded on the right by Monte Santucci, a high table-land where there is a large vineyard, and on the left by Monte Guarnieri a wooded height with some farm houses. The vineyard, the woods and the farmhouses had been strongly occupied by the advanced guard of the Garibaldian army composed of battalions of riflemen from Genoa, Lombardy and Leghorn, commanded by Major Burlando, Col. Missori and Captain Meyer, as soon as the approach of the Papal army had been discovered and Garibaldi had found himself obliged to stop his march towards Tivoli and accept battle at Mentana. The rest of his troops were assembled in and around the village.

The dragoons who preceded the Papal column as scouts came upon the Garibaldian outposts about half past twelve, exchanged shots with them and galloped back to give the alarm. General de Courten immediately extended the first company of Zouaves under Captain d'Albiousse, and the second under Captain Thomalé to the left and right of the road in skirmishing order; the third under Captain Alain de Charette and the fourth under Captain Le Gonidec following as supports. The Garibaldians were soon driven from the woods, but the Leghorn rifles of Captain Meyer and a Genoese battalion under Captain Stallo, held the tableland to the right of the road, where their heavy fire checked the advance of the Zouaves till their line was strengthened by the companies of Captain de Moncuit and Captain de Veaux; and when Lieut.-Col. de Charette hastened up with the company of Captain Lefebvre he led a furious bayonet charge which swept the Garibaldians before it. They tried in vain to rally and reform their ranks behind farm-buildings or clumps of trees, their positions were stormed one after another and the shattered battalions were driven back upon the Santucci vineyard, leaving behind them a long line of killed and wounded.

The Santucci vineyard, an extensive walled enclosure, in which stands a large farm-house which had been loop-holed, was held by the battalion of Major Ciotti. It defended the approach to Mentana from the East across the high ground which dominates that village, while the road running in a hollow at its feet, was swept by the fire from the Castle of Mentana, and Monte Guarnieri on the opposite side of the road, served as an outpost to the vineyard and protected its flank. This position had, therefore, to be seized first and the company of Captain Alain de Charette climbed its steep sides and dislodged the Garibaldian sharpshooters from their hiding places among the trees. A piece of artillery directed by Count Bernardini

then opened fire on the Santucci vineyard, from a farm which had been just taken by the company of Captain d'Albiousse and a company of Swiss, while Lieut.-Col. de Charette at the head of his Zouaves supported on their right by five companies of Swiss attacked the vineyard in front. The walls of the enclosure were soon scaled and the Garibaldians driven back into the farmhouse, where they held out for some time till the doors were broken in, when they laid down their arms, but this success cost the Zouaves one of their officers, Captain de Veaux, who had distinguished himself at Castelfidardo, and who fell during the assault struck by a bullet through the heart.

There were still large bodies of Garibaldians in the woods to the left of the road, but the company of Captain d'Albiousse, that of Captain de Charette, a company of Swiss and the Légion, which then came into line, soon drove them from their shelter out on the slopes which descend towards Mentana, and poured a heavy fire on the fugitives who were hastening from all sides towards the village.

It was then two o'clock, there was a cessation of hostilities for a few minutes, during which the wounded were picked up and carried to the ambulance, and General Kanzler, who had established his headquarters at the Santucci Vineyard, prepared to attack Mentana.

The castle of Mentana, a mediaeval fortress belonging to the Borghese family, stands on a rock with precipitous sides which advances from the high road into a deep valley; it was held along with the village in its rear and the barricades at its entrance, by four battalions of Garibaldians under Lieut.-Col. Friggyesi, a Hungarian; the high ground above the village to the East, where there was a large farm house, with stacks of hay and corn, was occupied by Colonel Elia, Lieut. Col. Paggi and Major Valzania with nine battalions; Major Cantoni, with three battalions was stationed to their left on the road leading to Monte Rotondo, and the two guns which had been taken at that town were drawn up on Monte San Lorenzo, some distance in the rear.

General Kanzler placed on Monte Guarnieri three guns, two of which were French, and escorted by two companies of chasseurs, another gun on the high road and two more in the Santucci vineyard, in order to silence the fire of the Garibaldian artillery and throw their forces into disorder. The Zouaves then advanced from the vineyard, the companies of d'Albiousse, de Charette and de Veaux (the latter commanded by Lieutenant Fabri) leading in skirmishing order, followed by three companies under Major de Lambilly. Five companies of Swiss carabineers and the *Legion*

*d'Antibes* covered their left flank. The Zouaves drove the Garibaldians out of a building called the Conventino, from which the ground rises towards Mentana, but when they came in sight of Colonel Elia's battalions, it was no longer possible to restrain them; and too impatient to wait till the fire of the artillery had disorganized the ranks of the enemy, they broke away from their officers and charged, heedless of the commands of their Colonel or of the sound of the bugles, they dashed forward, driving the Garibaldians from every hedge or clump of trees which they tried to defend, and flung them back into the houses of the village. There the hail of bullets which was poured from the loop-holed walls stopped the impetuous charge, but they held their ground, and sheltered by the haystacks, returned the fire of the Garibaldians. A sudden attack of the enemy dislodged them for a while from their position, but Major de Lambilly's three companies hastened to their relief, they quickly reoccupied their post, and at this spot, which was several times lost and retaken, the combat lasted till nightfall.

The attack on the village of Mentana having thus been stopped, Garibaldi sent two strong columns to turn the flanks of the Papal army. The first, composed of three battalions, marched from the northern end of the village and nearly succeeded in surrounding two companies of Swiss carabineers which had been sent from the left to the extreme right of the line. They retired slowly and in good order, firing as they went, until they were re-inforced by two more companies of their regiment, two of the *Legion d'Antibes* and a company of Zouaves, when they dashed forward again, broke up the Garibaldian ranks and pursued them as far as the road leading to Monte Rotondo. The second column, which advanced from the southern end of the village, did not meet with greater success. It was repulsed by three companies of the *Legion*, which followed it as far as the entrance of the village, broke into a house and made some prisoners, but was forced to retire in presence of superior numbers. It was then that the detachment led by Major de Troussures was seen advancing in the rear of the village towards the road leading from Mentana to Monte Rotondo. Garibaldi at once perceived that the battle was irretrievably lost, and that his line of retreat was in danger of being intercepted; he hastened therefore to provide for his safety and left Mentana, while his son, Menotti, still continued to defend the village.

It was then half past three; the Garibaldian chiefs resolved to make another effort to surround the wings of the Papal army; they assembled all the men still able to fight and again sent forward a column from each end of Mentana. All General Kanzler's troops

were by that time engaged and dispersed here and there over a great extent of broken ground; he had no reserves to meet these battalions which advanced in good order like well disciplined soldiers; and he therefore requested General de Polhès to bring his infantry into line. A French battalion of the line and three companies of Chasseurs, led by Colonel Fremont, marched at once to take up their position on the right of the Papal troops, and for the first time the "*Chassepot*" was brought into action. The combat ceased for a few minutes over the rest of the field, as the soldiers on both sides paused to listen to its rapid fire, as incessant as the rolling of a drum, before which the Garibaldians broke their ranks and fled back to Mentana or towards Monte Rotondo in spite of the efforts of Menotti Garibaldi and his officers to rally them. The column on the enemy's right wing met with the same fate, being attacked in front by a battalion of French infantry of the line, and on its right flank by Major de Troussure's Zouaves.

Mentana was now completely surrounded, and General Kanzler resolved to give the assault, though the Castle had as yet suffered but little from the fire of the artillery, and was defended as well as the village by some of the best soldiers of the Garibaldian army. The principal column of attack was led by General de Polhès; it was composed of two battalions of the line and three companies of chasseurs, but it was unable to force the strong barricade erected at the entrance to the village, and crushed by the fire from the Castle and from the surrounding houses, it retreated after losing several killed and wounded.

The fight then ceased, for night had fallen, the Garibaldian army was utterly defeated and scattered, and those who still held out in the Castle could hope for no assistance. The Papal and French troops then lit their watch fires round the village, threw out strong advanced posts and sentinels, and took every precaution against a surprise. The next morning at dawn, Major Fauchon entered Mentana with a French battalion, when some hundreds of Garibaldians laid down their arms, and about 800 others who formed the garrison of the Castle capitulated and were allowed to recross the frontier. The Garibaldians had left on the field over 1,100 killed and wounded, besides 1,398 prisoners in the hands of the Papal troops, while the loss of the latter was but 30 killed and 114 wounded, and that of the French 2 killed and 36 wounded.

Garibaldi continued his retreat to Correse on the evening of the battle, and crossed the frontier the next day with 5,000 men who were disarmed by the Italian troops; 900 others under Colonel Salomone escaped into the Abruzzi, while the General was arrested

on his way to Caprera and brought to the fort of Varignano, in the Gulf of La Spezia. The band of Acerbi, which, on the recall of the Papal troops to Rome, had entered Viterbo, where it had plundered the Municipal Treasury and exacted large sums of money from the Bishop and the religious communities, as well as the bands commanded by Nicotera, which had seized Frosinone, Velletri, Palestrina and Tivoli, had been followed as they advanced by the Italian troops which entered the Patrimony of St. Peter at different points, to the number of 5,948 men.[27] As soon, however, as the arrival of the French expedition and the victory of Mentana allowed the Papal Government to reoccupy these towns, the Italian soldiers were withdrawn, the Garibaldians fled across the frontier without fighting, and peace reigned once more in the territory of the Holy Father, while the whole Catholic world felt reassured by the solemn declaration made on December 4th, by M. Rouher, in the Corps Législatif, in the name of the Imperial Government, that France would never allow Italy to seize Rome or the territory still remaining to the Holy See.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London.

[27] Cavallotti, p. 664.

## WISEMAN'S MIND AS REVEALED IN FABIOLA.

A GREAT man will prove his greatness in what may seem to many trivial acts; sometimes the more because of the very smallness of the act he performs. In his leisure hours, when he is least on his guard as to what men may think or say of the deed he performs, when his mind is relaxed and we are allowed to enter and examine for ourselves, then it is that we often get a grasp of the true soul and character of a man which is hard to gain from his other more elaborate and perhaps better known doings. Above all may this be said to be true of writers. We see a man nowhere more truly than in his letters; and after these, perhaps the works of his idle moments—those which from circumstances, and because of their own very slight substance, are most likely to be passed over or forgotten—perhaps these are the second best sources of knowledge we can have when we would inquire into the soul of a man. At all events this is true; if we would know a writer as he is, with all that is great and good and all that is human and small in him, we cannot afford to pass over the works of his less strained powers.

For this reason, one who would see into the inner soul of Wiseman may study with advantage the one prose story he has given to us. Written, as he tells us himself, in his leisure moments, at long intervals during a year, and at a time when he was in the fullest vigor of his vigorous life, it is bound to contain traits of strength and weakness the more apparent because the more undisguised and the more rough-hewn. In other works we may expect to find the workman with his labor done; here we may hope to catch him in his study in the midst of his tools, trying his hand upon work to which it is unaccustomed, failing here and succeeding there, drawing upon his best resources of talent and of learning to help him in his unusual but self-imposed task, and therefore with his interest fully awake, and his energies all active, for us to study at our leisure.

The first impression one must receive of Wiseman under whatever aspect one looks at him, must be that of his intense laboriousness, his great capacity for work. As a boy at Ushaw he seems to have left that impression behind. There he did not appear as a lad of learning, nor as a genius, nor as a wag; all that seems able to be recorded of him is that he was a hard student. At the English College, too, his early years were seemingly unmarked by any other

striking characteristic; and when at length, at the age of twenty-six, he did burst forth into public notice, it was by a volume every page of which is stamped with the prints of hard, unceasing, patient labor. After that, his toiling never ceased. Whether in his private study, or on the public platform, in Rome or in England, we find the spirit of intense, sacrificing labor about everything he has left to us. No book but is full of references, no sermon but gives proof of hard reading and deep meditation, no work undertaken for his fellow-men but means for him toil of mind and body to the utmost of their capabilities.

"Fabiola" is no exception to the rule. Its very history and origin is enough. Other men make the writing of a story their life's work, and are held, and rightly held, to be men of labor. Wiseman began his romance, as he tells us, "with an understanding that it was not to be an occupation, but only the recreation of leisure hours." And so it was written. At times when most men find it a necessity to rest altogether from work of any sort, the author found the means to carry on his little book;—"early and late, when no duty urged, in scraps and fragments of time, when the body was too fatigued or the mind too worn for heavier occupation, in the roadside inn, in the halt of travel, in strange houses, in every variety of situation and circumstances—sometimes trying ones."

Nor is it only the history of the book which brings out this characteristic. Every page speaks of intense labor—labor of study, labor of assimilation, labor of combination. It was written "generally with few books or resources at hand;" then he must needs have been master of his subject before he began. The story must in its main features, at least, have been clearly before the writer's mind during the whole time of its being committed to paper; this involved no small strain upon the mind. Constantly during the development of the narrative situations are made simply to allow the author the opportunity of bringing home some useful fact of history or antiquity, or of teaching some lesson of religion. All this, again, called for constant watchfulness and care, and that, if it is not to be a serious effort, must imply that labor, in the ordinary acceptation of the word, has become a second nature in its possessor.

No man will work long and severely who has not a whole heart in his labor; this, then, will be a second trait we may expect to find in Wiseman. And it is so. Whatever task he undertook, to that task he devoted himself body and soul. At first it was the silent study of his early training; later, it grew into the examination of Eastern manuscripts. Then his superiors appointed him to rule and to guide others, and here again he knew no half measures, he

left no stone unmoved that he might do his duty to the full. Lastly, the good of England and of Englishmen occupied his thoughts, and to this end he devoted all his energies, all his stories of past knowledge. So it is in "Fabiola." It teems with knowledge, with earnestness. He keeps nothing back, he spares no pains. Many will impute it to him for a fault that he overcharges his story with information, that he writes too evidently 'for a purpose," as critics word it. He cares not; from the outset he has avowed his intention of writing to instruct, to rouse interest in an age that should be instinct with profitable food for thought, and every other consideration must be sacrificed. He knows that he has not the leisure to prune and rearrange and consult the refinements of art and literary taste; so, poet and refined master of art criticism as he has proved himself to be already, he makes this lesser end give way to the greater. He has set an object before himself, and to that he will adhere, come what may of injury to his own reputation as an artist. "It is indeed earnestly desired," he has said, "that this little work, written solely for recreation, be read also as a relaxation from graver pursuits; but that, at the same time, the reader may rise from its perusal with a feeling that his time has not been lost, nor his mind occupied with frivolous ideas. Rather, let it be hoped, that some admiration and love may be inspired by it of those primitive times, which an over-excited interest in later and more brilliant epochs of the Church is too apt to diminish or obscure."

This seriousness of purpose governs all his words and actions, and is the one guide in his choice of scenes and events. And what so strikes us in the book appears no less truly in the life of the man. There was a time when it must have seemed that Wiseman was destined to play a large part in the development of Oriental studies. He began life as such, and he proved the power that was in him for the task; but he did not carry out his work to the full. It had captivated him in the beginning, but it failed to occupy his whole energies. He was born for something else—for the busy, active, serious life that is lived among men who live about him, not for the passive life of books. Again, he had shown that there was in him the poet and the artist, but again these could not satisfy him. Not even could he be content with the peaceful academic life which he lived in Rome—those happiest of his days, as he himself has told us. He could be satisfied with none of these. One thing alone was enough—active life for the souls of his fellow-men in the busy thoroughfares of an English city. Thus did his nature guide him to his proper place. Every step must have meant a great sacrifice to a man whose affections were so strong, and whose heart was so wholly in his work. Yet he never hesitated. Cheerfully, without

demur, he stepped from one platform to another, sacrificing, but not throwing away, curing the wound that each sacrifice made, by further devotedness in a wider and more congenial sphere, yet never losing the interest and the love which had held him of old. And so, when he comes to the height of his power, he is able to look back upon the work of his early days and draw from it that which will help on the work of the present; and "Fabiola" is the result—a story in a true sense, but more than a story. Had it been that alone, he would have put it down a failure. His vigor of mind and his longing of heart for the good, and not merely for the pleasure of his fellow-men—their lasting as opposed to their passing happiness—drove him to more than this. That he could have written a more perfect story had he chosen is apparent from the outset. Again and again we find him deliberately laying aside the tools of the novelist. His conversations are stilted, and often unnatural, His descriptions of character are clipped, often to mere outline.

Even Fabiola's figure must be only touched upon. On her first introduction to the reader, the author warns him, "It is by no means our intention, nor our gift, to describe persons or features; we wish more to deal with mind." As for the first of these, we may wish that he had intended otherwise; as to the second, that he had no gift for such writing, we may surely be allowed to doubt. The author of the "Last Four Popes" needs no words of ours to prove that he knew the persons of men, and knew how to describe them. Nay, even the characters themselves in the book before us would seem to have developed themselves, in all their personality and in all their features, almost in spite of the writer's intention. Fabiola, dark, handsome Fabiola, with her prim Roman features, and her thoughtful, high forehead, clothed in her usually dark robes, that clung about a slender, but not weak figure, reserved to her equals, stern to her inferiors, acknowledging no superiors, haughty and unbending with all and even with the emperor himself, with all the good and all the bad that is in her revealing itself in every look and action; the character is as true and real as any from the pen of a Thackeray or a Stevenson. So, too, with Agnes, so with Sepa, and his men are not less striking. Sebastian is a soldier, every inch of him, not, perhaps so firm in the details of his portrayal as Fabiola, but none the less standing clear before us, a tall, straight, handsome fellow, with his auburn hair hanging loosely about his shoulders, a face open and frank, and happy, but seldom smiling, with that expression of thought which wins confidence and draws the weaker towards it, a body vigorous and well-shapen and strong, that is made the more admirable, though not affectedly so, by the glittering armor of a centurion of the body-guard—such a man as an

emperor would be proud to know was standing behind his throne. Pancratius, too, that silent yet impetuous school-boy, whose step is so light, and whose eye is forever lit with the fire of talent and of innocence, and of brimming youth all combined, whose face is flushed with a ruddy glow, and whose hand is restless when not occupied in work on which his soul is intent, whose thoughts are too old for his years, but yet who proves his real youth by his trusting confidence—we see him as he stands with Sebastian on the balcony in the summer evening, and recognize him without a doubt.

So in spite of himself, Wiseman has succeeded. He knew what was in man, and his knowledge compelled him to go aright. But it is not only here that we feel he has let the story-teller give way to the instructor. From time to time he leads us up to some vivid piece of scenery, or frames some exceptional action, of which a modern novelist would have made much, and rightly. For instance, that first recognition of her brother by Syra, the slave.

"She was in the court below, returning to her blind friend, when she saw one of the noble guests of her mistress' table alone, and, with a mortified look, crossing towards the door, and she stepped behind a column, to avoid any possible, and not uncommon. rudeness. It was Fulvius, and no sooner did she, unseen, catch a glimpse of him, than she stood for a moment as one nailed to the spot."

The scene is dramatic in the extreme—a slave girl, once a lady in her own land, who has been betrayed by a worthless brother and indirectly brought so low, recognizing among the guests in her master's house that very brother in honor and good repute, and yet submitting to let him pass by without a word of inquiry from herself. Yet the language is not equal to the subject; it falls behind and lags into the mere didactic narrative. The author has deliberately made light of his chance; deliberately, for all the while we feel there is a nervousness and even vividness in the style which could have risen higher, had it so chosen.

More true to the action is the description of the wretched Fulvius' dream.

"Both threw themselves on their couches; Fulvius on a rich bed, Eurotas on a lowly pallet; from which, raised upon his elbow, with dark but earnest eye, he long watched, by the lamp's light, the troubled slumbers of the youth—at once his devoted guardian and his evil genius. Fulvius tossed about, and moaned in his sleep, for his dreams were gloomy and heavy. First he sees before him a beautiful city in a distant land, with a river of crystal brightness flowing through it. Upon it is a galley weighing anchor, with a figure on deck, waving towards him, in farewell, an embroidered

scarf. The scene changes, the ship is in the midst of the sea, battling with a furious storm, while on the summit of the mast the same scarf streams out, like a pennant, unruffled and uncrumpled by the breeze. The vessel is now dashed upon a rock, and all with a dreadful shriek are buried in the deep. But the topmast stands above the billows, with its calm and brilliant flag; till, amidst the sea-birds that shriek around, a form with a torch in her hand, and black flapping wings, flies by, snatches it off from the staff, with a look of stern anger, displays it, as in her flight she pauses before him. He reads upon it, written in fiery letters, NEMESIS."

Once more we have a good idea, and once more the language, though failing to come up to the subject-matter, yet shows vigor and power enough to do great things had time and convenience allowed. Such passages could be multiplied. Sometimes he even goes out of his way to introduce scenes and passages that would be more likely to catch a modern reader; but seldom does he do them full justice. They are all rather suggestive of being a provision of material to work upon, than of being the finished work itself.

That his imagination was vivid and true requires little proof. Wiseman's sermons and lectures, his meditations and essays, are sufficient evidence. And in Fabiola we find abundant instances, small indeed at times, as though the author grudged their showing themselves, but they would come forth in spite of him. For instance Pancratius' fancy of a starry sky:

"True, Sebastian; and I have sometimes thought, that, if the under-side of that firmament up to which the eye of man, however wretched and sinful, may look, be so beautiful and bright, what must that upper-side be, down upon which the eye of boundless Glory deigns to glance! I imagine it to be like a richly-embroidered veil, through the texture of which a few points of golden thread may be allowed to pass; and these only reach us. How transcendantly royal must be that upper surface, on which tread the lightsome feet of angels, and of the just made perfect!"

Or take again the play of fancy as he accompanies a messenger to Fundi:

"The road by which he travelled was varied in its beauties. Sometimes it wound along the banks of the Siris, gray with villas and cottages. Then it plunged into a miniature ravine, in the skirts of the Appenines, walled in by rocks, matted with myrtle, aloes, and the wild vine, amidst which white goats shone like spots of snow; while beside the path gurgled, and wriggled on, a tiny brook, that seemed to have worked itself into the bright conceit that it was a mountain torrent; so great was the bustle and noise

with which it pushed on, and pretended to foam, and appeared to congratulate itself loudly on having achieved a water-fall by leaping down two stones at a time, and plunging into an abyss concealed by a wild acanthus leaf. Then the road emerged, to enjoy a wide prospect of the vast garden of Campania, with the blue bay of Cajeta in the back-ground, speckled by the white sails of its craft, that looked at that distance like flocks of white-plumed water-fowl, basking and fluttering on a lake."

Again, there is strong imagery, with no weak use of words, in the passage where the future martyr burns the imperial edict against the Christians:

"And he thrust it into the blazing fire, while the stalwart sons of Diogenes threw a fagot over it to keep it down, and drown its crackling. There it frizzled, and writhed, and cracked, and shrunk, first one letter or word coming up, then another; first an emperor's praise, and then an anti-Christian blasphemy; till all had subsided into a black ashy mass."

Each of these passages suggests an actively imaginative spirit. But they have all another quality in common. Seldom does the writer forget that he is also a teacher. Each picture has an object; something more than an effort to catch the admiration or to gratify; in each one there is an underlying meaning which any may read. Still it is not always so. Sometimes his inborn love of nature asserts itself, and he allows it full scope, knowing well that it is good to admire the works of God. At one time the graces of the panther in the arena are his theme, at another some wondrous pieces of Italian scenery; sometimes the seasons and their changes suffice. For Wiseman loved Italy, and her beauties were worthy of a place in his narrative. Take his description of the month of October:

"The month of October in Italy is certainly a glorious season. The sun has contracted his heat, but not his splendor; he is less scorching, but not less bright. As he rises in the morning, he dashes sparks of radiance over waking nature, as an Indian prince, upon entering his presence-chamber, flings handfuls of gems and gold into the crowd; and the mountains seem to stretch forth their rocky heads, and the woods to wave their lofty arms, in eagerness to catch his royal largess. And after careering through a cloudless sky, when he reaches his goal, and finds his bed spread with molten gold on the western sea, and canopied above with purple cloud, edged with burnished yet airy fringes, more brilliant than Ophir supplied to the couch of Solomon, he expands himself into a huge disk of most benignant effulgence, as if to bid farewell to his past course; but soon sends back, after disappearing, radiant messengers from the world he is visiting and cheering, to remind us he will

soon come back, and gladden us again. If less powerful, his ray is certainly richer and more active. It has taken months to draw out of the sapless, shrivelled vine-stem, first green leaves, then crisp, slender tendrils, and last little clusters of hard, sour berries, and the growth has been provokingly slow. But now the leaves are large and mantling, and worthy in vine-countries to have names of their own; and the separated little knots have swelled up into luxurious bunches of grapes. And of these some are already assuming their bright amber tint, while those which are to glow in rich imperial purple are passing rapidly to it, through a changing opal hue, scarcely less beautiful."

So on for two pages more. And here we may notice another fact. Though the tale is one of the days of the Catacombs, Wiseman makes much use of the present and its teachings for his guidance. Indeed we may say that the knowledge of the present, its natural aspect and its human element, joined with his own wide antiquarian research, forms the foundation of the whole narrative. Italy to-day, *mutatis mutandis*, is after all the Italy of fifteen hundred years ago; and there are some things in nature which fifteen hundred years cannot affect. As for man, he is at heart unchanged; he is always the same, with his noble qualities and his meannesses, his spiritual and material element combined, his proneness to fall and yet his power to rise again. Circumstances may affect his outer bearing. One age may make prominent one virtue or vice, another another; still the nature of man abides the same. Wiseman's men and women, boys and girls, their thoughts, and words, and actions, are very modern indeed. He looks upon what he sees and hears about him, and observes the principle that is illustrated. He knows that there is nothing new under the sun. He knows that history will forever repeat itself, that what has been shall be, and what is has been. And so he builds up his scenes, his characters, his conversations, his lessons. Italy to-day, yesterday and always; Fabiola, Fulvius, Syra, Pancratius, Sebastian, Coecilia—we fancy we have seen something not wholly unlike them in our own time, something which, put to the same test, would have produced the same results. Even Agnes, the innocent angel on earth, who sometimes seems to us something more than human, even she comes before us as a simple creature, angelic indeed, yet none the less a Roman lady, with a human heart, and human love, and human temptations, and the human power of working with and for her fellow-men. We find her ever happy, ever merry with her friends, of whom there are many. Thus does she enjoy her discovery of a poor blind girl's holy secret.

"As she went back into the court, Agnes entered the room, and

laughingly said, 'So, Cæcilia, I have found out your secret at last. This is the friend whose food you have always said was so much better than mine that you would never eat at my house. Well, if the dinner is not better, at any rate, I agree that you have fallen in with a better hostess.' "

And the language with which she announces her coming death to her friend Fabiola reminds us forcibly of many a scene in our own martyr prison-houses in our latter days, whose occupants were men indeed.

" 'What, to-morrow?" asked Fabiola, shocked at the idea of anything so immediate.

'Yes, to-morrow. To prevent any clamor or disturbance about me (though I suspect few people will care much), I am to be interrogated early, and summary proceedings will be taken. Is not that good news, dear?' asked Agnes eagerly, seizing her cousin's hands."

Wiseman was very human. His whole life was for men and among men. Until he had reached the period of his life when he could devote himself wholly and entirely to men, living men, he seems to have been more or less unsettled. In the midst of his books, of which he made so much, in the midst of that wide correspondence with the leading thinkers of his day, of which others would make so much, we feel that he is only half himself. Neither of these was his true vocation. But when he came back to his own country, and found a field, full of thorns and weeds, it is true, but still with a rich soil to be cultivated, then the true man appeared. He knew and loved the realities of things and of men. He appreciated great heights of sanctity, but he knew well that such heights were not for most men; and as he had sacrificed his deeper pursuits for what might be of service to the greater number, so in his spiritual teaching his aim was rather to raise up and encourage the weak than to advance with the strong. Hence we find him giving us these pictures of the human nature of the virgin martyr; pictures entirely agreeing with a doctrine which we come across more than once in his writings. Take for instance, this from his Meditations:

"If a preacher or a guide tells us we must become saints, we imagine he is extravagant, and would have us aim at an impossibility. We ask, 'Do you expect me to work miracles, or perform wonderful austerities?' We even say often, 'I have no ambition to be a saint, I shall be quite content to be saved,' as though these were not identical. But in the beginning of the Church, it was not so. All followers of Christ were called Saints; 'the Saints' was a distinctive appellation of Christians; and thus they were reminded of

the obligation under which all true Christians live, of being or becoming saints, holy men, with lives entirely dedicated to God. It was not expected of all of them that they should raise the dead to life, or perform other wonderful works; yet all were expected to walk worthy of their title, and of the calling which it implied. Let us therefore start from this principle, that the duty of holiness is the duty of every Christian, and we shall be disabused of our erroneous notions. We shall see that a man may be as well a saint at the counter or workshop as at the altar, in the metropolis as in the desert, at home as in a monastery, in a college as in a hermitage. It will be seen that one may be a saint by the practice of the meanest duties as much as by the performance of the most striking acts of virtue; by modest, recollected prayer, as easily as by ecstatic contemplation; by laboring at humble employments as much as by discharging the sublimest functions of the ecclesiastical state. We shall discover that sanctity is not a profession, but a duty; not a privilege, but an obligation; not dependent upon particular acts or functions, but attainable through the most ordinary means. We shall see how every action of he day is an instrument of sanctification, and that if all were performed with a proper end, with a true godly spirit, with diligence, resignation and charity, the sum of them all is holiness; that holiness after which we are all called to aspire."

With such wide sympathies always goes the instinct to forgive. And Wiseman possessed it, too, in an eminent degree. Hence, in "Fabiola," we know from the outset that the renegade Torquatus will one day be received again into the fold. It may be that the story is the weaker for the scene of the reconciliation—the author is willing that it should be so. Even when the traitor Fulvius comes back to Rome in the days of peace as a penitent pilgrim, we are not taken by surprise. In another author this would have been no more nor less than to have depicted downright hypocrisy; in Wiseman we know it to be that the forgiving nature has conquered all the rest; he cannot allow the brother of Syra to be utterly lost.

But it is not only to his own flock that the master teaches. He has a word and many a word, for others too. Underlying the whole picture of the antagonisms between Christianity and Paganism, we think we can discover something of the struggle between Catholicity and Protestantism in our own time. There is the same confusion of historical evidence, the same accusation of idolatry, the same ridiculing of what is sacred. Assumption of knowledge is taken as a proof that a man is learned, and that what he says is of the truth. For instance, is there not something of a certain type of

modern Protestant in Calpurnius, who thus learnedly discoures over the dinner-table on the origin of Christianity?—

"'The Christians,' said he, 'are a foreign sect, the founder of which flourished many ages ago in Chaldœa. His doctrines were brought to Rome at the time of Vespasian by two brothers named Peter and Paul. Some maintain that these were the same twin brothers as the Jews call Moses and Aaron, the second of whom sold his birthright to his brother for a kid, the skin of which he wanted to make gloves of. But this identity I do not admit; as it is recorded in the mystical books of the Jews, that the second of these brothers, seeing the other's victim give better omens of birds than his own, slew him, as our Romulus did Remus, but with the jaw-bone of an ass; for which he was hung by King Mardochœus of Macedon, upon a gibbet fifty cubits high, at the suit of their sister Judith. However, Peter and Paul coming, as I said, to Rome, the former was discovered to be a fugitive slave of Pontius Pilate, and was crucified by his master's orders on the Janiculum. Their followers, of whom they had many, made the cross their symbol, and adore it; and they think it the greatest honor to suffer stripes, and even ignominious death, as the best means of being like their teachers, and, as they fancy, of going to them in a place somewhere among the clouds.'"

Something of truth mixed with so much that is ridiculously false; yet surely not more than much that we hear to-day of the Roman mission and the Papacy.

Similar, too, is that other diatribe of the same wise man before the emperor:

"He struck up a different strain, and his learning quite astonished his fellow-sophists.

* * * [Their] rare books Calpurnius had seen, and he would build his argument entirely on them. This race made war upon every king and people that came in their way, and destroyed them all. * * * And this was all because they were under the government of their ambitious priests; so that when a certain king, Saul, called also Paul, spared a poor captive monarch whose name was Agag, the priests ordered him to be brought out and hewed in pieces.

'Now,' continued he, 'these Christians are still under the domination of the same priesthood, and are quite as ready to-day, under their direction, to overthrow the great Roman Empire, burn us all in the Forum, and even sacrilegiously assail the sacred and venerable heads of our divine emperors.'

A thrill of horror ran through the assembly at this recital. It was soon hushed, as the emperor opened his mouth to speak.

'For my part,' he said, 'I have another and a stronger reason for my abhorrence of these Christians. They have dared to establish in the heart of the empire, and in this very city, a supreme religious authority, unknown here before, independent of the government of the State, and equally powerful over their minds as this. Formerly all acknowledged the emperor as supreme in religious, as in civil, rule. Hence he still bears the title of Pontifex Maximus. But these men have raised up a divided power, and consequently bear but a divided loyalty. I hate, therefore, as a usurpation in my dominions, this sacerdotal sway over my subjects. For I declare, I would rather hear of a new rival starting up to my throne than of the election of one of these priests in Rome.'"

The spirit of this is strikingly like that spirit which put to death the martyrs of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But the answer was the same then as now. In another place, where the soldier Sebastian and the boy Pancratius are talking together, the younger of them says:

"What! do you contemplate the overthrow of this empire, as the means of establishing Christianity?"

To which the soldier answers:

"God forbid! I would shed the last drop of blood, as I shed my first, to maintain it. And depend upon it, when the empire is converted, it will not be by such gradual growth as we now witness, but by some means so unhuman, so divine, as we shall never in our most sanguine longings forecast; but all will exclaim: 'This is the change of the right hand of the Most High!'"

And in still other places he returns to the same subject. But there is a third class of passages which are, perhaps, even more instructive and more valuable. They are those in which the master speaks as from the heart lessons which he cannot but teach, because he has so well learnt them himself. Such, for instance, is the short paragraph where he dwells upon the fraternal love that should be the mark of all Christianity—a passage which could be paralleled by so many more from all his works. It runs:

"The servant now announced that Agnes' litter was waiting at the door; and anyone who could have seen the affectionate farewell of the three—the noble lady, the slave, and the beggar—would have justly exclaimed, as people had often done before, 'See how these Christians love one another!'"

"As people had often done before!" There is much significance in that little phrase. No man knew better than Wiseman, the importance of true love; and it would be hard indeed to find one who has said so many strong things in praise of a friend, or in defence of

the love that is prompted in us by nature. That is one of the characteristics of his spirituality. And here is another. It has often been the case—indeed, probably it is usually the case—with the learned men in God's Church to have a special reverence for Christ's lowly ones. Their own deep learning does but seem to bring home to them this truth, that all they have and all they are is after all nothing, that of themselves they can do nothing, that God can, and often does, make use of the weak things of this world to confound the strong, putting down the mighty and exalting the humble. So it was with Wiseman. He always served the poor and ignorant; with all his spirit of work and study, he never ceased to teach the lesson that there was a science deeper than that which the study of any man could attempt even to touch. Consequently, when the refined pagan lady Fabiola and the Christian slave Syra are together, he cannot lose his opportunity. Syra teaches her mistress lessons which confound her with their wealth of mystic meaning. Upon which the author comments thus:

"The reading generally pursued by Fabiola was, as has been previously observed, of rather an abstruse and refined character, consisting of philosophical literature. She was surprised, however, to find how her slave, by a simple remark, would often confute an apparently solid maxim, bring down a grand flight of virtuous declamation, or suggest a higher view of moral truth, or a more practical course of action, than authors whom she had long admired proposed in their writings. Nor was this done by any apparent shrewdness of judgment or pungency of wit; nor did it seem to come from much reading, or deep thought, or superiority of education. For though she saw traces of this in Syra's words, ideas, and behavior, yet the books and doctrines which she was reading now were evidently new to her. But there seemed to be in her maid's mind some latent but infallible standard of truth, some master-key, which opened equally every closed deposit of moral knowledge, some well-attuned chord, which vibrated in unfailing unison with what was just and right, but jangled in dissonance with whatever was wrong, vicious, or even inaccurate. What this secret was she wanted to discover; it seemed more like an intuition than any thing she had before witnessed. She was not yet in a condition to learn that the meanest and least in the Kingdom of Heaven (and what lower than a slave?) was greater in spiritual wisdom, intellectual light, and heavenly privileges, than even the Baptist Precursor."

It is well to notice the relation between these two, for in some sense the author's love of the humility of the handmaid would seem to have made him allow the slave to out-do her mistress, whom he

had intended at the first to make the heroine. The steps in their intercourse seem to bring out well the main virtues on which Wiseman loved to dwell. First, Syra bears with meekness and patience a fit of ill-temper in her mistress; then Fabiola, out of a natural sense of justice, tries to make atonement to her slave. This meets with its reward; for Wiseman knows how to value even the natural virtues. Fabiola's interest in her slave is deepened into something like affection. But it is not yet love, because to love a slave would have been a humiliation she could not endure. So she has to be taught the lesson of humility. This again starts from a natural foundation; she submits herself to learn from Syra. And as the humility is strengthened, so is the love deepened. Love draws them closer and closer together, drawing them to the natural end of love—likeness. Thus the conquest is attained; the mighty are put down from their seat, and the lowly are exalted. The weak things of this world are used to confound the strong—a truth which Wiseman, with all his learning, with all his insistence on learning, and with all his intercourse with the learned of all nations, is never tired of inculcating.

Much more might we say to illustrate how his zeal and love for souls bubble over even in these few pages, ever bringing home to the young—for we presume that it is above all else for the young that Fabiola is intended—lessons of true teaching; lessons of sacrifice and love for the poor in the giving up of wealth that they may be gainers; lessons of warning against the dangerous literature which grows apace around us, as it swarmed around the school of Cassianus; lessons of encouragement to study the history of the early Church, as well worth our time and labor as is that of any age of the world's development; of protest against the narrowness of men, who will persist in seeing evil when there is only good, blinded by the assumptions and prejudices in which they have been reared; of the need of being ever ready to take the time and the hour when God shall speak, as was Fabiola on her critical day; of exhortation to lay aside the indifference to religion, a vice always prevailing, but perhaps never more so than now; of emphatic upholding of the doctrines of the Church, one, holy, catholic, and apostolic, the same to-day and forever.

But we have said enough on this topic. We have tried to pierce into the heart of the man who could think so deeply and broadly and so well. We have found him, even in this work of his leisure hours, a man full of much love, of much sympathy, of much zeal. Men may differ from him in his creed, but none will deny him this; that he was a good man, and that he labored unceasingly—*importune, opportune, in omni patientia et doctrina*—for the good of his

fellow-men, and above all for the good of his countrymen. For this he gave up much, for this he did much.

He might have been the greatest scholar of his day, perhaps of his century—even by the little he did he won for himself a world-wide reputation. He might have stayed in Rome and risen in dignity and honor, even to the highest throne the world has to offer. He might have made the world of literature resound with the eloquence of his rhetoric or the brilliance of his writings—none who have studied his early sermons, and lectures, and essays, whether written for English or for Italian readers, can gainsay this. But he gave all this, and more than this, for there are sacrifices which great men must make unknown to any but God and their own souls. In this light must we judge "Fabiola." That it teems with faults none can deny. In point of composition it is badly balanced, in many parts badly arranged; yet from time to time there are marvellous connecting links which prove the author to have had the capacity for more finished work had such been his aim. The dialogues are often stilted, even to weariness, yet they possess, too, another fault at times which show that he might have amended his work had he had the leisure—they are often, if we may say so, too colloquial. The characters are sometimes hazy and lacking in life and color; yet even in this, as we have tried to show elsewhere, he has risen above his ordinary tenor in more than one place, both in this book and in others; and none who know Wiseman will say that he was unskilled in the knowledge of human character. And lastly the style and language are full of flaws, sometimes even he is careless of grammatical accuracy; yet we know, his early writings prove it to us if nothing else, that he was an ardent student of style, that he had an extraordinary command of language, and that his very first appearance before the world was occasioned by a study of words.

This is something we gain from a re-reading of Wiseman's "Fabiola." In it we see a man weak with the weak, toilsome with the toiling, sympathetic with those not without fault, but withal a great and burning soul, filled with a great and burning zeal, and accomplishing great and noble work in spite of its faults, perhaps indeed the greater and the nobler because of them.

Alban Goodier, S. J.

Stoneyhurst College.

## SOME WORDS AND THEIR USES.

SOMEONE is accused of having said that of all entertaining books a dictionary stood first; while other books are limited in their vocabulary, their style, their subject and in everything that goes to make up a book, the dictionary is absolutely untrammeled; the mind has only to wander through the columns of words and choose, like an emperor, what shall go to the building up of a monument more lasting than brass; true, a judicious selection of permutation and combinations makes all the difference between a Tennyson and the untamed poet of the evening paper, yet for that very reason none need complain of his liberty being restrained; the whole world of words stands there subject to the nod of the reader, waiting only to be marshalled into order and life. The tyrant may find pleasure in ordering his subjects about like chess-men, but the humane despot will vary the programme by occasionally taking a human interest in his subjects, inquiring into their fortunes, good or bad, the history of their ancestors, or their capabilities. It is from this point of view that we propose to act the amiable despot; nor are our subjects unworthy of such condescension. Some of them may be narrow minded and possessed of a single idea to which they cling, partly because it is the fashion of the hour, partly because they become confused by more; others, like Ulysses, have seen many men and many climes, and have store of anecdote. Nowhere better may an introduction be made than in Murray's English Dictionary, where no word may appear without rendering an account of itself and of its claims to distinction.

The last issue of this gigantic enterprise in the way of lexicons brings before us the history of the word *gas*, a history of great interest though the word itself is of comparatively recent origin, being the name invented in the sixteenth century by the Dutch chemist, Van Helmont, suggested to him from the Greek *chaos*. The treatise *De Ortu Medicinae* of this distinguished scientist was translated into English soon after its appearance in Holland by Chandler, and from him we get what, presumably, Englishmen of the time (the subjects) of the Stuarts thought of the new arrival. "Because the water which is brought into a vapour by cold is of another condition than a vapour raised by heat; therefore—for want of a name I have called that vapour Gas, being not severed from the Chaos of the Auntients—gas is a far more subtile or fine thing than a vapour mist or distilled oyliness, although as yet it be many times

thicker than air. But Gas itself materially taken, is water as yet masked with the Ferment of composed Bodies." Why "Blas," which was another invention of Helmont's, failed to survive, we do not know; that it had a brief career we see from Franck's Northern Memoirs (1694): "Insomuch that neither Gass nor Blass, nor any nauseating suffocating fumes, nor hardly death itself can snatch them from Scotland."

After reigning for a time in solitary grandeur the word came to mean generally any aeriform fluid. The introduction of coal-gas, however, gave our friend a right to be once more exclusive, and we find in the very beginning of this century the word applied alone in ordinary use to the illuminating product of coal. This position of distinction has been retained with success, and all new rivals on the field may indeed call themselves gas, but always, or nearly always, with a qualifying epithet; even nitrous-oxide, that boon to suffering humanity, must keep its name, and in all likelihood will retain it, of laughing-gas. Occasionally however, what moderns would call the atavistic tendencies show themselves, and the word descends into low company, and we find it used to express boastful talk, humbug. "Lord Shaftesbury calls the poor thieves together and reads sermons to them, and they call it gas.'" (Emerson, English Traits.) The practical applications of coal-gas have given quite an imposing progeny to our little word, many of the compounds being themselves an epitome of the progress of the arts, such as gas-motor, gas-harmonicon, gas-spectrum, gas-microscope, &c. We may well spare our readers further exploration into the history of this very prolific family.

The animal world presents us with a word which in England at least has a long descent, dating even from before the arrival of the Conqueror; the "crane that has totally forsaken this country" (Permant. Zool. II. 513) has left a name which will probably last as long as machinery is used; the great structures of word or iron which play with great weights as though they were toys were no doubt suggestive to the invention of the long-legged, long-necked, long-billed bird of that name. It is certainly remarkable how many of our terms for mechanical appliances are taken from animals, e. g., monkey, donkey-engine, gooseboard cock mule—all words familiar to engineers if not to the lay-folk; nor did imagination stay here: those huge cisterns, mounted on pivots, to be seen in any of our railway stations for feeding the engine with water are eminently suggestive, by the long spout projecting downwards, of the crane's bill; and in fact the bill of this bird has been so marked a feature that all virtues would seem to have been centred in it; thus a siphon

for drawing liquor from a cask is called a crane. The verb *to crane* is rich in metaphors drawn from the actions of the bird; thus, *to crane* may mean to raise or lower with a machine, to stretch out the neck, to 'look before leaping,' evidently from the implied notion of stretching the head over a hedge to see what is on the other side. This word supplies an example, though not a very striking one, of the way in which words become degraded, the comparatively indifferent action of craning acquiring the sense of cowardly hesitation.

A more striking instance is seen in the word *maudlin;* "maudlin tears" arouse neither sympathy nor admiration, but time was when the tears of the penitent Magdalene (pronounced 'maudlin') were a source of loving contemplation and encouragement to thousands of good souls; what profane tongue first dared to use the phrase in any but the Scriptural cause we do not know, and perhaps it is as well its traducer should be lost to posterity; it is, I daresay, the comparatively few who know or suspect any but the degraded usage of the phrase. This is a glaring case of where language has lost by degradation of sentiment, and the beautiful thought which hovered over the expression like an angel has fled. An instance less painful is *silly*, the primary meaning of which was 'happy,' 'innocent,' 'blessed'; the 'Silly Lamb of God' was a devout expression in early times, now it sounds almost blasphemous. There is matter for thought in the qualities of innocence and happiness, suggesting stupidity or want of intellect; we can at the present time furnish a 'missing link in this evolution of degradation, or shall we call it adaptation to surroundings or survival of the unfit? in the words *simple*; the meaning of this word is perfectly fluid, and the context alone can help us to its true sense when some one predicates of a man that he is simple. The corresponding German word has also a strange history; by itself *selig* means blessed, but in composition its meaning seems to be quite overborne by the word with which it is compounded; thus *arm-selig*; i. e., 'poor-blessed,' means simply poor, and '*gluck-selig*' or luck-blessed means happy. Might arm-selig be a tract of the first of the beautitudes, "Blessed are the poor?" We might imagine how such a word would appeal to the seraphic St. Francis. Not long ago the "rollicking bun" of Gilbert & Sullivan attracted attention to its ancestry in the pages of the Spectator. There is some reason to think that we pilfered it from the French, though the evidence is not quite clear; in old French *bugne* meant a swelling, only the diminutive *bugne* was used in the meaning of loaf or cake. Now, at least, the word is thoroughly English, though local usage alone can settle what form the bun will take; the Scotch

bun is a very rich cake, all fruit and spice, while the Irish bun is merely a round loaf of bread; the English variety is best described by those who have travelled and have had satisfactory evidence, internal at least, of the "staying power" of the bun of commerce. Hot-cross-buns are historic; they are described by Hone in the Every Day Bk, I. 405, as . . . consecrated loaves bestowed in the Church as alms, and to those who . . . . . could not receive the host . . . made from the doe from whence the host itself is taken."

In the early Church blessed bread used to be given to those catechumens who, not being yet baptised, could not be permitted to approach the Holy Table. St. Augustine, speaking of this custom,[1] says: "What they (the catechumens) receive, although it is not the Body of Christ, yet is it holy and holier than the food of which we partake, since it is something sacred (quoniam *Sacramentum* est). We may notice here incidentally the wide meaning which *Sacramentum*, or sacrament, had before the term was restricted by the needs of scientific theology. Every Catholic child is now familiar with the strict definition of a sacrament and probably attaches no other meaning to the word: "An outward sign of inward grace, ordained by Christ, by which grace is given to the soul." The word is a relic of the Roman law courts; *Sacramentum* was the pledge of money which litigants had to pay into the treasury to defray the expenses of the court, the winner of the cause being allowed to withdraw his money; the oath of allegiance required of every soldier was also known as a *Sacrament*, and this usage is preserved in the French derivative *Serment* in its more general sense of an oath. Among the early Christians the word was held in the widest sense as an equivalent of the Greek μυστήριον or *mystery;* anything connected with religion or religious rites was a *Sacramentum.* To return to our blessed bread: we see a provision of he Synod of Rouen forbidding blessed bread to be given on the days on which the faithful were expected to communicate. These blessed breads were often interchanged by the faithful as tokens of friendship, and were often cut from the loaves which were used for the Holy Sacrifice, of course before the consecration; this practice was not allowed during Lent, so the prayer over the people was said (*oratio super populum*), that they might in this way at least have some share in the communion. The devotion of the middle ages suggested all kinds of names for the bread given in charity or taken home by the devout faithful from the Church. The loaves of the Holy Spirit were given to the poor all during the week of Pentecost with

[1] De Peccatorum misit et remiss, lib. 2, cap. 26.

measures of wine to correspond.[1] The bread distributed to the poor on the feasts of Pentecost and Ascension was blessed with a very imposing ceremonial, of which the procession was no inconsiderable part, led by lights and incense and holy water with solemn chants.

Many of the feast days of the saints were made the occasion of these charitable displays.

At first sight a word such as brown would seem to have its career already marked out and limited with few possibilities of expanding; yet its history brings us into contact with many interesting developments. The phrase 'a brown study' is sufficiently familiar and suggestive; the earliest uses seem to convey the idea of sadness, rather than of mere abstraction, which is the modern meaning of the term; by one of those curious changes of meaning so frequent in words we find 'brown' meaning 'bright'; thus in an old ballad we find: "My bonny brown Sword," and in one of the early English illustrative poems a "Brende golde bright," as gleamande glas burnist broun." A gleaming brand not unnaturally suggests the old 'Brown Bess' of the beginning of the century; to one who has seen only a few specimens of this venerable weapon as exhibited in our museums it is tempting to enunciate boldly that the name is due to the brown colour of the barrel; unhappily for such a speculation the process of "browning" the arm was not introduced till 1808, as announced by the Morning Post of October 3, of that year: "The cropping of the soldiers' hair is to be followed by the browning of the hitherto bright barrrel and lock of the musket. An enquirer in the Gentlemen's Magazine expresses his difficulty to comprehend why the weapon should be called Brown Bess and not rather Brown Nan or Molly; it is possible that the popular liking for alliteration may have determined the name as well as the consideration of providing a companion to the more ancient 'brown bill.'

Readers of Hudibras will remember the lines:

"But when his 'nut-brown sword' was out,
Courageously he laid about." (Canto II, ll 797-8),

Where the meaning does not seem to be, as in the passages before cited ,a gleaming blade, but one which is perhaps brown with thin films as one may see in an old blade left long untouched; this interpretation would seem borne out by the quotation in Mr. Milnes' notes from the ballad "of Robin Hood and Guy of Gisborne:

> To see how together these yeomen went
> With blades both brown and bright."

In which brown and bright are contrasted.

[1] CharterGeraldi. Abbatt. Augereanus. Anni 1385 in Chartul Monastris Du Cange.

It is a curious fact that the origin of the word *bachelor* is lost in obscurity, its original meaning being doubtful, though the modern one is confined to an unmarried man of marriageable age or to one who has taken his (or her) degree at a university. The older language had a greater variety of meanings; a knight too poor or too young to display his own banner, and who, therefore, followed the banner of another was called a bachelor, and this use gave rise to the spurious derivation of *bas chevalier*. Hallam, in his Middle Ages, describes bachelors as vavassours who obtained knighthood, a knight bachelor,—a list of them may be seen in Whitaker's Almanac —is the full title of a gentleman who has just been knighted without, however, being admitted to any one of the recognized orders. The term was used to describe other social conditions; thus, a younger member of one of the great guilds or corporations was called a bachelor, his office being to attend on the Master and Wardens of his craft. In the universities the lowest degree was taken by the bachelor, whose office was to teach under the superintendence of a master; after two years the bachelor might proceed to his licentiate, which gave him the faculty of teaching independently. There is a curious but rare use of the word in Ben Jonson to describe an unmarried person of the other sex; those curious in such matters might compare the restriction of the word child to the meaning of a female infant. "Is it a boy or a child?" is an expression not unfamiliar to many.

For transformation of sense few words are more interesting than *bead*, at first meaning a prayer, then indifferently the prayers or the beads in which they were counted, and finally the string of beads without any reference to their original employment. Of the devotion of our ancestors to the "beads" there is most abundant testimony in early documents; there is no need to describe for Catholics the manner of this devotion nor do our limits permit us to describe the various ways in which paters and aves and the various meditations on the events of our Lord's life were distributed; but like many other survivals the string of corals which up to a few years ago used to adorn the necks of children were the representative of the beads which our forefathers used to wear; worn too often now, alas! with none of the beautiful thoughts which they were meant to suggest. What was once an object of piety was degraded to an ornament. It would be a startling sight if a merchant appeared on 'change now-a-days with his rasary round his neck or on his arm, or at his waist; yet this would seem to have been a familiar custom in the fifteenth century judging from effigies and brasses of that date, where they are represented as hanging

from the girdle, a fashion which one may observe among the ladies in some Catholic households in England at the present day. It was natural that when worn on the person they should be made of rich material; hence we hear of Lady Godiva bequeathing her circle of threaded jewels on which she was wont to number her prayers, to be hung round the neck of Our Blessed Lady's statue at Coventry; so, too, we hear of beads of gold laced with silk, crimson and gold, and with tassels of the same precious metal. Alanus writing in the 15th century speaks of large rosaries hung up in the churches for public use. A frequent accusation made against Catholics in the time of persecution was their stubborn attachment to the use of beads, or as they were sometimes called *gauds*. Any one wishing to know more on the subject would consult with profit the chapter on Beads and Bells in Fr. Budgett's Dowry of Mary. From the linguistic aspect of the word we meet with a curious parallel in Spanish where 'contar,' to count, gives 'cuenta' a bead. All the compounds of this word are redolent of the piety and charity of our forefathers; for instance *bead-folk* pensioners who pray for the soul of a benefactor; *beadhouse*, an *almshouse* of which the inmates were expected to shew their gratitude for the good things of this life by being mindful of the souls of those who had provided them. The word bead-roll in itself conjures up a whole history of ancient practise with regard to prayers for the dead. More than this: anyone familiar with the early history of the Church will remember the importance which was ascribed to the entrance of names on the diptychs, or tablets containing the names of those who were to be prayed for in the course of the Holy Sacrifice. Without going beyond our own country we have ample evidence of the use of *bede-rolls* or lists of persons to be prayed for. An interesting article in the Month of December, 1896, describes one of these rolls as being seventy-two feet long and eight or ten inches wide! Apparently a length of forty or fifty feet was not unusual; even with our means of economising space with the use of type one is astonished to see the amount of room which the mere enumeration of the names can take up, as one may find by dipping into the volumes of the *Neues Archiv den Geschicts su quellen.* Many of the religious houses were in the habit of offering their prayers in communion for the benefit of their dead members, so that it became necessary that a formal announcement should be made to the other communities when a member of some one of the body died. The name was inscribed on a roll, often with a slight account of the deceased's life or in the way of a panegyric on his exemplary life, and the roll given to a messenger

(hence called a *rolliger*), whose duty it was to call at the various houses which claimed this brotherhood of prayer; there he delivered up his roll, which was sometimes countersigned and dated by the superior, and the name of the deceased was copied into the necrology or book of the dead which lay upon the altar. If this monastery had suffered by the death of any of its members, their names were entered on the roll of the messenger and so forwarded on to all the houses which had entered into this alliance of mutual prayer. The writer of the above-mentioned article in the Month, and also Dr. Ebner, are of opinion that these confraternities, which formed very large, one might say, European organization, had their origin in England, and that their spread on the continent was due to the influence of missioners from this country.[1] In any case it is painful to realize how the word *bede-roll* with all its aroma of piety and charity is now almost a stranger to the language of its people, a dried and painted mummy, as it were of its former self; one cannot but wish for the day when a new life-blood will be infused into the corpse, so beautiful even in death.

The word confraternity is strongly suggestive of a word perhaps more familiar to British ears—*guild* or *gild*, as others will have it spelt. One of the oldest words in the language, and connected with another word, Dane-gelt, which recalls a time when England had not the supremacy of the seas. According to Skeat: "The insertion of *u* though common is quite unnecessary and is unoriginal," and this would seem to be the case if the word is derived from the Anglo-Saxon *gild*, payment; others claim it as derived from the Welsh or Breton *gouil*, a feast or holiday. Whether the development of guilds depended or was influenced in any way by the *eranoi* of the Greeks and the *collegia* of the Romans remains at present a disputed question; we know, however, that they existed in England in the 7th century and on the Continent a century later, and by the 14th century were an acknowledged power. The purposes of these institutions were various, but even where they would seem most secular, the religious element was always present, and indeed often formed a considerable factor. They were organised generally to promote some work of mercy and charity, and at the same time the members were accustomed to have social gatherings at fixed times; all this was elevated by the society thus formed being consecrated to God under the patronage of Our Lady or of one of the Saints. According to Fr. Bridgett[1] it would seem that all respectable per-

[3] Month, Nov., 1896. "Prayer for the dead," by Fr. Thurston.
[4] Our Lady's Dowry; chap. xii.

sons belonged to one or more of these guilds; being meant primarily for lay-folk, the members of course were as a rule lay-men, but priests might belong to them, and we have examples also of princes being admitted to the privileges of membership. It would be impossible within the limits of a short article to enumerate even the good works done by these associations; schools, churches, even colleges were founded by them, not to speak of hospitals, almshouses, and other institutions, besides the particular helps afforded to sick or impoverished brethren. Nor was this philanthropy confined to the things of this life; many of the guilds assembled on certain days to assist at a solemn dirge for the repose of the souls of departed members, as also to hear mass for those who still survived. These reunions were also often made the occasion for a brilliant pageant, and there is but little doubt that the companies often vied with one another in the splendor of their mystery-plays; on this subject we might add that there could be hardly any loftier subject for the drama, or one more calculated to instil the truest education than these spectacles, drawn as they often were from the life and deeds of Our Lord or of His Saints. So far as I know, there were few, if any, secret there was referred entirely to the particular trade of the comsuperiors to be obeyed, but all was open to the day, and whatever secret there was, referred entirely to the particular trade of the company. On the Continent the *confrariae* were not always free from the pest of secrecy, and the councils of Avignon, Arles, Montpelier, Toulouse, all have decrees directed against these unholy associations, productive of so much misery to the state. In England the guilds flourished up to the time of the Reformation, when their riches attracted the appreciative and financial mind of Henry VIII, and they, with the monasteries, were called upon to fill the purse of their bluff sovereign. The encouragement which the Popes gave to the formation of guilds and the privileges which they receive from the Holy See are matters of history, and after the very plain terms in which the present Pope encouraged trades unionism in his labour encyclical of some years ago, nothing need be added.

From the Lord Chancellor to the little Board School boy who is acquiring the art of cancelling is a great jump, and neither perhaps ever think of the common bond which unites them; as little would one expect to conceive a connection between the bar of the Old Bailey and the chancel of Westminster Cathedral; nor yet can it be said to be misfortune which produces such bedfellows, for it was by honorable promotion that the *cancellarius* or usher in the Roman courts rose to the dignity of Chancellor of the kingdom. The 'cancelli' or lattice-work screens round the tops of houses in Palestine,

were, according to Joannes de Tanna[1], the places whence public proclamations were read to the people; the idea was very naturally transferred to the railed partitions of the judicial bar, and the *cancellarius* was one who acted as doorkeeper at this lattice; in the East the title came to be applied to the notary and secretary, as also in France; and so finally to anyone having charge of public documents. The office of Chancellor in England as one who had charge of the royal seals, charters and documents, or 'keeper of the king's conscience', was introduced into England by Edward the Confessor. At the present day of course we abound in chancellors of various departments, all being high officials; Scotland confers the dignity on a foreman of the jury!

The word *cancelli* besides its generic meaning of bar or grating came to be applied specially to the screen separating that part of a sacred building preserved for the clergy from the portion occupied by the laity, and with the usual device of making a part represent the whole, it came to mean the *presbyterium* itself, the *bema* or *adyton* of the Greeks, the chancel of later buildings. The substantive gave rise to a verb *cancellare*, to cancel, that is, to draw palisades, an effectual method when done with pen and ink over a manuscript of blotting it out, hence the now familiar word cancel. The substantive cancel exists in an interesting form in Jeremy Taylor, who speaks of the "cancels of the body," that is, the prison of the body.

The history of the words cancel and chancel is also interesting from the point of view of their training, if one may use the expression; cancel coming with a certain scholastic primness untouched from its Latin ancestors, while the other has acquired a French polish by the well-known change of *ca* into *cha*, which characterises so many words which were adopted at an early period into the French language, numerous instances such as L. *cantare*, Fr. *chanter* will easily present themselves to the mind of the reader.

A want of full acquaintance with the history of a word will sometimes lead into rather amusing errors, two of which are signalised in Fr. Bridgett's book 'Blunders and Forgeries.' The mistake turns on the meaning of the word *religion* in the Middle Ages which was then the equivalent of the present expression 'Religious Order.' Some ancient documents are discussed where "leave to pass from one religion to another" is granted under certain conditions; one learned editor comments on the grant as an extraordinary example of religious tolerance! while another makes the following reflection: "Thus in the Church of Rome a still stronger term was in use for different monastic societies than in these days of modern toleration

[1] Quoted from Fr. Bridgett's *Blunders and Forgeries*, p. 80.

is applied to the sects into which the Christian church is now divided."[1] Whatever be the divergences of Ritualists and Evangelicals they do not profess to be of different religions, and the editor in question would seem to have thought that Benedictines, for instance, regarded Dominicans as belonging to quite another creed! Many of us no doubt have read Archbishop French's "History of Words" with great interest and profit, yet as Catholics we could hardly fail to be hurt by the unjustifiable manner in which he seizes on this special use of the word *religion* in the Middle Ages, and writes with indignant horror of the restriction of the word to signify the monastic state, as if religious feeling and practice were impossible without the observance of the vows. To the Catholic there is nothing repellent in regarding that state as *par excellence* the state of religion where men not only kept the precepts but in addition bound themselves by vow to the observance of the counsels; many, even excellent Christians, may not feel themselves called to so high a vocation, but they can hardly be acquainted with the teaching of the New Testament unless they recognise the state of poverty, chastity and obedience at the call of Christ to be the more perfect: "If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast and give to the poor and follow Me." His Grace might have been mollified a little had he dipped into the documents of the Belgian archives or of those of Simancas; he would there have seen the word *religion* used often enough to designate the innovations of the 16th century. It is hardly too severe to say that the modern use of the word is degraded when it can be applied to the beliefs and practices of Mohammedans, Confucians, Brahmins, Buddhists, and the less refined if not brutal fetichism of an African village.

(Rev.) F. King.

Oxford, England.

# Scientific Chronicle.

## THE NEW SYSTEM OF TELEGRAPHY.

Signor Marconi's wonderful method of sending messages through space without the aid of a wire has given greater results than the most optimistic, twelve months ago, had ventured to hope for. Beginning at the little harbor of Kingston, six miles from Dublin, last summer, the inventor was enabled, by personal supervision of the working of his process, to send the details of a yacht race from his vessel up to a newspaper office. Emboldened by the success of this experiment, he has gone much further. A little later he crossed over to France, and by means of towers erected at favorable points on either side, he was enabled to put himself into communication, from the French shore, with people in England. Now we near of his intention to try the capability of his system to overcome the distance between Europe and this continent. This looks like pushing the idea too far. By means of towers fifteen hundred feet high, it is thought atmospheric communication may be established. Taking into consideration the spheroidal curve of the distance, the idea does not seem quite practicable, but in the lexicon of science there is no such word as fail. If the tower idea be found feasible, there seems no reason why the cliffs at Achill, on the west coast of Ireland, might not be availed of as a substitute at one side of the ocean. Some of these cliffs are said to be a couple of thousand feet high. But whether the trans-ocean idea succeed or fail. there can be no doubt that Signor Marconi's invention, in its present state, must prove to be of enormous practical value along the littoral of every country. It must naturally displace the heliograph, which can only be worked in the daylight, and with the help of sunshine or the artificial disruptive discharge. But day and night the wireless telegraph could be made the medium of instantaneous interchange of news from port to port, around every coast where commerce finds many inlets and outlets. It appears destined to prove a most beneficial servitor to commercial progress, but like every other scientific discovery it seems to have its limitations.

## THE SCIENCE OF FILTRATION.

It is beginning to be realized that we do not pay sufficient attention to the purity of the water we use for drinking and cooking purposes. This truth was suspected some twenty centuries ago by sundry Roman emperors who caused aqueducts to be built in order to get better water than the Tiber from places at a distance. But many municipal bodies, especially in America, seem to regard it as open to question whether pure water is really an essential of existence or merely insisted upon as a scientific fad. Germs, they seem to think, may be classified—those which are beneficial to the human system and those which are not. Hence, we may charitably suppose, the hesitation about providing large cities like Philadelphia with a supply of properly filtrated water. The germs which are beneficial and those which are noxious, they may argue, may be able to neutralize each other when antagonized in the viscous flood of the Schuylkill, and the City thus be saved from an initial outlay of many millions for filtering beds. But even those citizens who belive in filtration have had their faith shaken very seriously by recent warnings that the filters commonly used for domestic purposes become powerless to prevent the entrance of the insidious germ after a short period of service. A French scientist, M. Hausser, claims to have discovered a material for a filtering clay which is absolutely germ-proof. It is the infusorial earth known to geologists as fossil farina. The earth is prepared by sifting it to remove impurities, raising it to a temperature of about 1,000 degrees, then cooling it and pulverizing it very finely. The powder thus obtained is insoluble and communicates no taste to the filtered liquid. It is mixed with the liquid to be filtered and the mixture is poured into an ordinary filter. The liquid runs out, and the powder, because of its lightness, is deposited in a regular layer. This layer constitutes a very compact and finely porous filter. It is capable of retaining the smallest particles and the smallest microorganisms. As there has been no fusion, there is not the slightest loss of efficiency. The absence of rigidity is a point in its favor, for it makes possible frequent renewal and cleansing. When the filtering power of one layer is exhausted, it is simply washed off with a stream of water and another is formed. The rejected substance is renewed by washing it in acid, drying it, and calcining it again.

## ARTIFICIAL PRODUCTION OF DIAMONDS.

It was recently demonstrated that diamonds can be actually produced by artificial means. This was long held as a theory, but its realization was deferred by reason of the fact that no material for a crucible could be found to withstand the enormous degree of heat necessary for the success of the experiment. The mode by which this difficulty has been surmounted was described last year, in a lecture by Sir William Crookes, the inventor of the famous tubes for the production of X-rays. The lecture was reported in the *Engineering and Mining Journal.* That portion of it which contained the gist of the matter stated that the first necessity was to select pure iron and to pack it in a crucible with pure charcoal from sugar. Half a pound of this iron was then put into the body of the electric furnace and the arc formed close above it to utilize the electrical current passing through it. The iron rapidly melts and saturates itself with the carbon. After a few minutes it is heated above 4,000 degrees—a temperature at which the lime of the furnace melts and volatilizes. The current is then stopped, and the crucible is plunged beneath the surface of cold water, where it is held until it diminishes to a dull red heat. The sudden cooling solidifies the outer layer of iron, and holds the inner molten mass in a tight grip. The expansion of the inner liquid in solidifying produces an enormous pressure, and the dissolved carbon separates out in a transparent dense crystalline form —in fact, as diamond. Then commences the more tedious part of the process, the attacking the metallic mass with solvents to liberate the diamonds, the crystals of graphitic oxid, carbonado, and bort—the cleansing operations being repeated until all the well-washed grains are collected and examined under the microscope. The laboratory diamonds burn in the air before the blowpipe into carbonic acid, and in luster, crystalline form, optical properties, density, and hardness are identical with the natural stones. It is certain, from observations made at Kimberly, corroborated by the experience gained in the laboratory, that iron at a high temperature and under great pressure will act as the long-sought solvent for carbon, and will allow it to crystallize out in the form of diamonds.

---

## THE PATHOLOGY OF SUNSTROKE.

It must have occurred to many scientific men that although our soldiers and sailors have for several months past been operating

in some of the hottest regions of the globe, very little is heard of cases of sunstroke among them. We hear of men having had to drop out of the ranks because of the heat, but so far there has been little mention of sunstroke. Probably we may have some light thrown upon the subject when the medical men who have accompanied the troops have had time to prepare their reports and compare notes. But we may be certain that when the summer comes around again on this continent we shall hear enough about sunstroke among the ordinary population. Hence the theory started by Dr. Sambon in the *British Medical and Surgical Journal* last year is deserving of more attention than it has as yet received here. He pointed out that siriasis (heat-stroke) is unknown in many of the hottest parts of the world. Nor in the endemic areas is the disease always most prevalent in the warmest years, or at the hottest season of the year. Dr. Sambon's contention is that siriasis is an infection, is in fact produced by a specific germ; and he has brought forward a body of evidence which is very interesting.

After showing the weak points in the various theories based on the thermal idea of the causation of siriasis, he points to many carefully verified facts, to the geographical distribution, the endemicity, the occurrence of epidemics, the characters of the symptoms, the very definite lesions, the liability to relapse, and to other points in the natural history of the disease, as strong arguments for regarding siriasis as belonging to the same category as yellow fever, dengue, and certain other tropical affections universally acknowledged to depend on specific germs—germs for whose growth and transmission to man, and from man to man, high atmospheric temperature is necessary, but which though occurring in, are certainly not created by, high atmospheric temperature.

---

## THE HOMING INSTINCT OF THE CARRIER PIGEON.

Many theories have been propounded regarding the wonderful power of finding its way possessed by the carrier pigeon. Some scientific naturalists attribute it to a special sense unknown to other creatures, but this can hardly be regarded as an explanation. A French scientist, M. Thanzies, assigns to the pigeon a peculiarly sensitive magnetic organization and a special "local instinct," intensified by the process of heredity. By what may be called its sense of touch, he says, and by its sight, it registers, as it were, like a delicate mechanism, impressions as varied as they are com-

plex, which, resulting in the concerted action of the organism, enable it to determine in a given place, at a given moment, the direction in which the dovecote will be found.

It gets its direction best in the morning because it prefers to fly in the morning and because the atmospheric notions that it gets from this habit are clearer, more distinct, and more numerous. It gets its bearings without effort in a familiar direction because it then experiences, even before leaving the basket, the normal sensations that have previously guided it toward a definite part of the horizon. It directs itself slowly toward an unknown point because of the indecision resulting from the solicitations of an already despotic routine, and the new but not less imperious impressions that cause it to deviate from the accustomed route.

The failure of the carrier pigeons of the unfortunate Professor Andree to return to their starting point would seem to strengthen this theory, and to show that when those interesting birds are taken to an entirely unknown and extremely remote region their wonderful powers are completely nullified by their strange surroundings .

---

## LAST IMPRESSIONS ON THE HUMAN EYE.

Since the invention of photography the belief has somehow arisen that the eyes of the dead retain the impression of the last things seen before life was extinguished, and this curious idea was made the foundation of one of the leading scenes in a popular play. The image of a murderer is supposed to be discovered in a photograph of one of the victim's eyes. Science has since frequently attempted to explode this fallacy, because, in the first place it is incompatible with the interests of true science that fallacies should be allowed to live a moment longer when their illusory character has been proved. But somehow the fallacy has a curious trick of starting up again, after scientific men had thought it had been effectually disposed of. A London paper on the hunt for sensational subjects, like some others nearer home, revived the exploded hypothesis. A physician and enthusiastic photographer, it stated, being desirous of testing the amount of truth in the theory, had carefully examined the eyes of hundreds of dead people, and though he had never seen anything like a distinct picture mirrored he had certainly distinctly traced both letters and objects on the iris of the eye, and that when the photographic test was applied these images became visible. In one case a capital letter of peculiar form was shown which could be traced to a Testament held

in the hands shortly before death. In another case a numeral was distinctly pictured which was traced to a clock-face in the room. The article also stated that the chief scientific paper of France gave full particulars of a case where a woman who died in one of the hospitals had two numbers, 10 and 45, mirrored in the iris of her eyes.

Like religion, science suffers more, perhaps from the statement of the half-truth than from the most downright scientific heresy, and here is an exceedingly good case in point. The very small residuum of accuracy in this story was clearly shown by the *Lancet*, the leading British Medical authority. All such absurd stories, it declared, had their origin in the well-known experiments of Kühne on the visual purple of the retina, in the course of which he showed that by making special arrangements the cross-bars of a window focused on the retina could be brought into relief. The enthusiastic photographer ought to have known that no well-defined images of the external world are cast upon the iris, and none, therefore, could be preserved. The surface of the iris is far too uneven to act as a mirror. Moreover, as no arrangements were made to prevent the further action of light after death, they would if formed be certainly obliterated as the image on a photographic plate would be if permanently exposed. The only mode in which an image impressed on the retina could be rendered visible would be to adopt the method of Kühne—viz., by exposing the eye previously kept in the dark for a minute or two to an illuminated object, then extirpating it, opening it, and immediately plunging it into a solution of alum. The image develops in the course of twenty-four hours.

This exposure by the *Lancet* ought surely to prevent the resuscitation of what may be regarded as a modern development of the idea of the ordeal by touch, but error dies as hard as the hydra of Hercules, whose heads when lopped off started up afresh in some other portion of the chimera's anatomy.

---

## THE HEROES OF THE LABORATORY AND HOSPITAL.

The world hears much of the gallantry of men who fight their fellow-men with deadly missiles, but it is rarely indeed that the story of the far higher heroism of the physician and the nurse who grapple with death in its most awful forms in the laboratory and the pest-house is held up to public admiration. Medical history is full of heroism of this kind. Devoted doctors have again and again paid the penalty of seeking the causes of cholera and similar

horrible scourges, but these martyrs to humanity and science are never heard of, while the worshippers of a vulgar militarism go on shouting their vivas enthusiastically over the men who succeed in mowing down the most thousands of their fellow-creatures by means of superior machinery of death and superior skill in warfare. We doubt if the world ever listened to a more thrilling story than that of the Vienna physician, Dr. Muller, who succumbed to the plague in that city a few months ago while experimenting on the germs of the pest, and the brave Sisters who nursed the victims in the hospital. The fate of Dr. Muller seems to have had the effect of producing some consternation if we may judge from a recent article in *Natural Science*, evidently written with a view to allaying groundless fear on the question. The writer says that as a matter of fact such occurrences are very rare, and this for two reasons: The majority of pathogenic organisms soon lose much of their virulence when cultivated for any length of time outside the body; some become harmless in a few days, others not for weeks or months, while there are bacteria which seem to retain their pathogenic powers almost indefinitely. In most cases virulence may be restored by suitable passage through the animal body. The chief reason, however, for the rarity of accidents lies in the routine precautions taken in the laboratory when dealing with pathogenic organisms. Such precautions are the first lessons impressed upon the student; for they are necessary, not only as a safeguard to the experimenter, but in order to preserve the cultures themselves from contamination. In all good laboratories the beginner acquires, or ought to acquire, the technic necessary for the protection of himself and his cultures by practise upon harmless organisms. Once acquired, it becomes in time practically a reflex action, and the fear of infection is scarcely present to the mind. Nevertheless there will always be reckless persons, and accidents will at times occur. Some organisms are especially virulent and dangerous to work with, for instance, the bacillus of glanders. Even typhoid fever is perhaps at times contracted in the laboratory, and one fatal case of cholera has been definitely traced to this source. Such instances are, however, so rare as to be of historic interest. Laboratory infection is, in fact, a risk almost infinitesimal in comparison with the risks run in the post-mortem room or at the bedside, or even in a crowded omnibus. The wonder is, considering the many cases of contagious disease with which the physician is usually brought into contact, so very few cases of infection are recorded. The use of a little camphor, and the invariable practise of washing the hands after leaving the bedside of the sick, are the precautions which one of the most eminent medical authorities on contagious epidemics usually found all-sufficient.

## ARE THE STARS INHABITED?

This is a very old question, and is likely to be very much older indeed before any determining answer be forthcoming. It has been raised anew by reason of the singular appearances on the surface of the planet Mars, and the fact that an assumption in the affirmative has been seized by the scientists as an argument against Christianity will hardly cause surprise, since every possible assumption or pretext is utilized by this illogical genus to the same end. An eminent French scientist, bearing the unmistakably Irish name of Kirwan, recently examined the assumption in the pages of *Cosmos*, and dealt with it in an exceedingly able way.

M. de Kirwan dwells specially on the latest views that science has formed in regard to the moon, because he thinks the case of that heavenly body proves it a gratuitous supposition to believe that the organization and manifestation of life are the principal end of the general creation. That the moon was not created for the purpose of organizing and maintaining life seems, so far as our knowledge extends at present, entirely clear. Without doubt the earth was created for man. Its place in the sidereal universe was determined in view of man's existence, and in such a manner that he can utilize for his profit, at least in a certain measure, the other creations which are beyond his reach.

Life, continues M. de Kirwan, certainly can not exist in the sun, a globe of incandescent gases of a temperature in which no possible combination of elements could give birth to and support any organism whatever. Venus, by reason of the great inclination of its axis to its orbit, has summers of intolerable heat succeeded with abrupt transition by winters of excessive cold, at intervals of about fifty-six days each. These violent and frequent changes of temperature must result in storms to which the fiercest cyclones known on the earth would be child's play. In such an abode, how can you conceive of the existence and development of life? The condition of Mercury is still worse. It presents constantly the same face to the sun. One of its hemispheres is constantly calcined by the solar furnace, while in the other hemisphere there is always night and winter. Under such circumstances is life possible? Mars has an atmosphere, clouds, and seas. It does not, however, receive quite half the light and heat which the sun imparts to the earth, and each season in Mars being double what it is with us, it must have a long continuation of terrible cold. The red color of Mars seems to come from the nature of its soil in which predominates protoxid of iron. If this soil were covered by vegetation the pro-

toxid would be deuteroxid, which is black. Without vegetation it is impossible to have inhabitants. As to Jupiter, it is agreed that it is still in a liquid or at least pasty state. As to Saturn it is yet a gassy mass, and Uranus and Neptune are nebulous masses, without speaking of their very small participation in the light and heat of the sun.

It is plain, from these observations, that organized life, such as we know it, is not to be looked for in those celestial bodies which are nearest to us, and there can be little force in the assumption that the more remote planetary system may present conditions more favorable to the theory of their habitancy by human beings than those we find unsuitable. Mere conjecture is of no utility whatever as argument, and this is all that science is able to offer at present on this abstruse and interesting subject.

---

## DRAWBACKS OF CIVILIZATION.

Many biologists favor the theory that primitive man possessed acuter senses than men of modern days, and some go so far as to assert that he possessed an additional sense—somewhat like the instinct of the brute creation—which has been lost through the process of civilization and the habit of living in towns instead of in the open air, as man in his savage state did in many places. It is known that men living in the open air—in the forest, the wilderness, and the prairie—have much keener perceptions than the denizens of the cities. Powerful sight and acute hearing are, in especial, the compensations which nature yields for the comforts of civilized life. The *Hospital* (London) tells a story of a remark made by a Siberian nomad to the renowned scientist, Emanuel Arago. They had been both looking at the planet Jupiter, and the Tartar remarked that he had seen the big star swallow a little one and spit it out again, he had really seen, with his unaided eyes, an occultation of the third satellite. Sir H. Truman Wood, in a discussion on the subject at the Society of Arts, spoke of an Englishman who could see some of the double stars; but it must be remembered that the Englishman could easily know what stars were double, and could, perhaps, fancy that he saw their peculiarity; while the Tartar could have had no knowledge of the very existence of the satellite if he had not seen it. Mr. Carter maintained that the habit of seeing as much as possible, of earnest visual attention to the details of the environments, would certainly have the effect of increasing the activity of the visual function ,and also in all prob-

ability of promoting the growth of finer fibers in the retina, by the aid of which smaller images could be appreciated. It was suggested that vision should be trained in schools by the use of difficult test-objects set at proper distances; it being only work upon near objects that is ever injurious to the eyes, while work upon distant objects must always be of the kind by which the faculty exercised is likely also to be improved. It was maintained that sight might even be permitted to take its place among the physical qualities that are made the bases of competitions, and that prizes might be awarded for excellence. To railway officials it is certainly of the highest importance that sight-culture should be developed, as so much depends upon the vision of their employes in the operation of signalling.

# Book Reviews.

THE ETHICAL PROBLEM. By *Dr. Paul Carus.* Second enlarged edition. Chicago. The Open Court Publishing Co., 1899, pp. xxiv, 351.

About one-fourth of this work is made up of three lectures delivered nine years ago before the Society for Ethical Culture of Chicago. The author's views were widely discussed, and the criticisms and rejoinders occupy the larger part of the present volume.

The avowed purpose of the work is one which every right minded man must applaud. "Before we commence building," says the author, "let us have a plan. Philosophical views and also theologies are by no means mere theories having no practical value. They are, or rather they become if they are accepted as true, the maxims and regulative principles of our actions; and any ethics without a *philosophical view* back of it is no ethics, but ethical sentimentality" (p. viii.) To place a *philosophical view* back of ethics is the author's aim, a praiseworthy undertaking surely. The Catholic student may think this *actum agere,* he being familiar with a very well defined *philosophical view* back of ethics, one that invites and will stand the keenest analysis both from a historical and a scientific standpoint. Unfortunately Dr. Carus knows nothing of Catholic philosophy. Indications of this fact are patent on every page of this and his other writings. Now, what philosophical view does he propose? "Allmitary conception of the universe." This, with the author, means Monism, though not Pantheism. *Enthemism* he elsewhere calls it—"the view that regards God as inseparable from the world. God is the eternal in nature." This position at once casts misgivings on the *scientific* aspect of the author's ethical basis. The first characteristic of the scientific mind is acumen and accuracy in distinguishing. Where such fundamentally diverse entities as God and the universe are declared inseparable one may be prepared to find much other confusion. And such is the case here. The work superabounds in aphoristic generalities in which truth and error are hopelessly confounded. The negative assertions are, however, sufficiently plain. For instance we are told "that dogmatic religion can no longer serve as a basis for ethics. We [the author, it is presumable; he

mentions none other] no longer believe in the possibility of a supernatural revelation and search for another and a natural reason why we should live morally" (p. viii.) The author has much contempt, though some condescension, for the "old ethics," another convenient generality. The main objection he makes to the "old ethics" is that it was built on "supernatural religion." Now, "the religions of supernaturalism teach that the source of all goodness and morality is a great personal being residing beyond the skies; and he, by means of magic, implants into man's bosom the ethical ideal:" . . . whereas "the religion of science [whereof the author's system of ethics is the soul] recognizes that there is a power, an all-pervading law in the universe, which is not personal, but superpersonal (p. 20). Again, "the old religion of magic teaches that God works by magic and can in turn be worked upon by magic. Hence the institutions of prayer and adoration in spite of Christ's command that God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. The new worship ["the religion of science"] is no adoration, but obedience to the ethical laws. The God of science demands no creed, but deeds" (p. 21). Many more such dicta might be quoted illustrative of what the author is persuaded is *not* the basis of ethics. As to what that basis is two things are certain: It must be constituted of "facts" and must be "scientific," for "the religion of science accepts the verdicts of science. This does not mean that the opinion of every scientist is to be accepted as science, but only those statements which are proved by rational arguments and can be verified by experience, or, if possible, also by experiments." [*The Religion of Science*, p. 12.] As an illustration of such a statement the following will serve: Ethical "rules must have had a very slow growth at first; they developed unconsciously in the era when man was still an animal living in herds. Civilized society evolved from savage life in the degree that certain rules of conduct were more and more clearly recognized" (p. 5.) One is naturally curious to know the rational argument, experience or experiment on which this statement is based.

The author's ingenuous invitation of criticism and his readiness "if convinced of an error to change his opinion and accept the truth, whatever it be," is deserving of praise. We sincerely wish we could contribute something towards this end, the more so as there are manifest signs of high aspirations throughout his work. To use the words of one of his critics: "The author's innate goodness, loftiness of spirit reveals itself in his combating egotism, in

his lifting up his readers out of the slough of 'Spencerianism' and in the fact that he reposes the supreme ethical law in *truth*" (p. 323.) Criticism, however, of any avail would carry us much beyond our present limits, as we believe the author's entire philo- this statement would mean the writing of a much larger book than sophical system, root and branch, to be false. The making good of sophical system, root and branch, to be false. The making good of this statement would mean the writing of a much larger book than his own. In vindication, however, of the "Scientific" basis of the "old ethics" Dr. Carus might find some enlightenment from a study of Cathrien's *Moral Philosophie* (3rd edit., Herder, St. Louis, 1899), Guthberlet's *Ethik und Religion* (Münster, 1892), and *Der Mechanische Monismus* (Paderborn, 1893), as also Ming's *Data of Ethics* (New York, 1897). F. P. S.

---

CHRISTIANITY OR AGNOSTICISM? By the *Abbè Louis Picard.* Authorized Translation revised by the *Rev. J. G. Macleod, S. J.* London: Sands & Co., 1899. 8o, pp. xxvi., 633.

A young man has hardly reached the years of reflection when he is beset by the temptation to doubt. He sees around him the schism of minds on the vital problems of humanity. He has been told and he himself observes that men of high mental endowments are anti-Christians and even atheists. He notices that the trend of contemporary science is drifting from or set in opposition to the supermaterial and much more the supernatural. As a child the authority of parent or teacher suffices to protect him. But the older he grows, the more he reflects, the more doubt persues him. He feels, however, that the beliefs he had imbibed are the basis of his moral life, and he is urged by an imperative conscience to render, in satisfying terms, an account to himself of his religious convictions. He reads and inquires. Science answers him with the promise of an ultimate explanation of the riddles of existence, but the conflicting views of its recognized professors only deepen his perplexity. This in the rough is the Abbé Picard's sketch of the religious perplexity of the French youth. It is for them, thus beset by doubt, and in danger of losing their hold on religious truth, that some three years ago he wrote his *Chrétien ou Agnostique.* The book was favorably received in France, for it fitted in with the intellectual and moral needs and environments of the young men and women in the Lycée and University, and offered the needed mental direction of youth entering on the duties of life. Two leading purposes control the author's thought: First,

to prove that whilst modern physical science has wrought stupendous prodigies, it has no satisfactory answer to the problems of human origin, nature, conduct and destiny; the answer is given only in and by Christianity; secondly, to set forth in a way sufficient to convince the fair minded, the reasonable grounds of Christianity in its one historical and logical form, Catholicism. In other words the author's aim is to contrast the intellectual inanity and the moral mockery of Agnosticism with the strength and satisfactory responsiveness of Christianity. "*Christianity alone* gives a precise and a full answer to the problems that disquiet the human mind. Its solutions are not a *perhaps*, but a certainty" (p. 578.) In the unfolding of this thesis the author has had in view the popular difficulties and objections urged by captious infidelity against supernatural religion. His statement of his adversaries' position is always generous and his solutions full and clear. The book was not intended for the class room and is not technical or didactic. It is popular in the better sense of the term; not weak nor superficial. The style is luminous, often eloquent and reflects wide familiarity with the main fields of literature. Above all, the author's apostolic spirit breathes throughout; for the work was wrought by the mind, but written with the heart.

The peculiar mental environment of the youth of France is not precisely duplicated amongst English speaking people. Infidelity with us is not so aggressive nor so subtle. In this respect the Latin nations are an illustration of the *corruptio optimi pessima.* Nevertheless irreligion is sufficiently wide spread and insidious to make a translation of the Abbé Picard's work desirable, and one takes up the version here at hand with a certain pleasing anticipation that one may recommend it both as a remedy to those whose minds may unhappily have been already infected by the agnostic virus, and as a preservative to such as are obliged to live more or less in contact with the evil. The work is not, we need scarcely observe, such as will profit the simple-minded Christian. Unfortunately the translation is not done in a style which will warrant one's recommending it to an Agnostic. The literature of Agnosticism owes most of its ill-starred potency to the lightfulness and grace of its form. The mind addicted to such reading will hardly relish the Gallicized diction of the present translation. It is a pity the work was not adopted rather than translated. In the effort to be literal the sense of the original has sometimes been lost. For instance: "Science is the *verification of things in being*" (p. 5) is not a happy rendering of science *est la verification d'une chose existante*" (p. 7 of the original.)

Mr. Renan would not care to have his definition of time Englished in the sentence given at the top of page eleven. (Original, p. 12.) The phrase *éternel devenir* evidently means the *eternal process of becoming, fieri,* not *the future,* as it is here given. The translator has added occasional foot notes. Their authorship should have been mentioned, for we are sure the Abbé Picard would not wish to answer for the absurd expression at the bottom of page nine: "Extended matter is now proved to be an imaginary hypothesis." It is to be hoped that in a future edition the spelling of proper names, and the accentuation of French and Greek words will receive more careful attention. Though the translation will not satisfy the reader's literary taste, it is of value to the intelligent Catholic, lay and clerical, as bringing together within moderate compass the leading objections of Agnosticism and the fundamental arguments for Catholicism.

---

THE ROMAN PRIMACY, A. D. 430-451. By the *Rev. Luke Rivington, M. A., D. D.* 12mo, pp. xxii, 405. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The author tells us in his preface that while engaged in preparing a new edition of his book on "The Primitive Church and the See of Peter," which he hoped to bring from the press this year, he became convinced that the best answer to many difficulties raised against the historical proofs of Papal Supremacy and Papal Infallibility is to be found in a more detailed account of some crucial passage in the history of the Church within the first few centuries. For this reason he chose the twenty-one years in the first half of the fifth century, beginning with 430, and ending with 451, and entered into such detail as to gather together sufficient material to fill the present volume.

That particular period has been chosen because during those twenty-one years three very important councils were held in the East. Two of them were among the first of the Æcumenical Councils, and the third, between these two, was meant to be Æcumenical. The two most important of the group, the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, were convened to deal with the fundamental doctrine of Christianity. On those occasions the Church settled for all time two of the most fundamental points in regard to the great mystery of the Incarnation.

In these two councils we see the Church in combined action, dealing with a most important question of doctrine. This is the first clear view that we have of such action, for, historically speak-

ing, the Council of Ephesus was the first of the Æcumencial Councils, of which we have anything like ample records.

In trying to understand the true position of the Pope in the Church at the present time we must ask ourselves what was his position in the ancient Church? What was thought of his claims to Supremacy and Infallibility in those early days, and then what should be thought of them in these latter days. If by studying the action of the Church at this most critical period of her existence we find that her venerable head was looked up to as the authorized guardian of that body of revealed truth given by Christ for the permanent welfare of the human race, we must conclude that he was its guardian from the beginning, and that he will continue to be its custodian until the end.

The history of these councils would be interesting in any form, but it is particularly attractive as set forth by Doctor Rivington in this volume. He went over the historic road slowly and carefully before he entered the Catholic Church, and only when he had proved the way for himself did he invite any one else to go up by it. His researches, as well as his taste and ability, peculiarly fitted him for a task like the present. An indefatigable worker, he brought all his talent to bear on the task which he set for himself, and performed it conscientiously.

One who knew him well has said: "Never was a writer more conscientious or more painstaking in his literary work. How often have we known him to devote weeks and months of patient research in the British Museum or other libraries to get even a minute detail of his subject, so that the truth and nothing but the exact and irrefutable truth should appear upon his pages."

A melancholy interest is attached to the book, because since its publication the gifted author has died. His friends in England are now collecting subscriptions to erect a memorial column to him in St. Peter's Chapel in the Westminster Cathedral. This chapel is chosen as peculiarly appropriate because of his vigorous defence of the position of the successors of St. Peter in the first five centuries. As a friend has well said, "no recent works have so thoroughly and minutely followed up the misrepresentations by non-Catholics of the originals of the Councils as his have." Shortly before his death he had agreed with another writer to join him in the work of placing the originals of the eight General Councils in an English dress in the hands of students. His constant reading of the Latin and Greek of those days especially fitted him for such a work, and it will be very difficult to find another so well equipped. J. P. T.

HARD SAYINGS. A Selection of Meditations and Studies by *George Tyrrell, S. J.*, author of "Nova et Vetera." 12mo, pp. xx, 469. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

"Although the following conferences and meditations were in no way originally designed to be parts of a whole, written, as they were, at sundry times and in divers manners, yet there has been some imperfect attempt at method in their selection and arrangement which, though not very apparent on the surface, may make itself felt in the unity of their effect upon the reader's mind. Their purport is to illustrate and, so to say, turn over in various ways a very few of the deepest and most wide-reaching principles of Catholic Christianity. In choosing "Hard Sayings" for a title, allusion is made to the occasion when many of the disciples of Jesus turned back and walked with Him no more, because of His doctrine concerning the great Mystery of Divine Love, in which all the other mysteries of the Catholic faith are gathered up. That this man should give us His Flesh to eat, that bread should be His Body, is indeed a "hard saying" for the many who are the slaves of their imagination, and who fancy that they know something of the constitution of matter and the limits of Divine omnipotence. But for the more thoughtful it is a far harder saying that God should so care for man's love as to come down from Heaven and take flesh that He might woo man in man's own language—the language of suffering. And if these things are hard to the understanding it is still harder for the weak will to hear that God must be loved back as He has loved us, with a love that yields pain for pain, sacrifice for sacrifice, death for death.

Here the Church has ever been faithful to her Master. Others have, with false kindness, mitigated the "hard sayings," and prophesied smooth things and drawn away the weak from her side. But with all her human frailty, ever shrinking from the stern ideal of the cross, from the bitterness of the Chalice of her Passion, when asked she has but one ruthless answer, namely, that it is only through many tribulations that we can enter into the Kingdom of God; that Christ's yoke is easy, not because it is painless, but because love makes the pain welcome."

We have quoted this much from the introduction to the book before us, because the author explains its purpose much more clearly and briefly than we could, and because the quotation will give to the reader some idea of the author's style. Father Tyrrell writes well on any subject that he treats, and he never treats a subject that he does not know. He is a writer whose name is a guarantee of excellence. He always presents his subjects in a manner

peculiarly his own, and leads his readers up to them by new roads so that they see them from a new point of view. In the present instance he deals altogether with old subjects, but he has a new purpose in view. He explains it in these words:

"It is, then, the belief that a deeper and more comprehensive view of the Church's ethical and spiritual ideals; of her conception as to the capacities, the dignity and destiny of the human soul, of the hopes that she inspires in the midst of so much that is otherwise disheartening, of the light which she sheds over the dark abyss of sin and temptation and sorrow—it is the belief that such a comprehensive view may in some cases serve far more effectually than any direct apologetic to win, to establish, or to confirm an abiding faith in her divine origin and operation, that must partly excuse or justify an otherwise reprehensible popularizing of the "secrets of the King."

A noble purpose, indeed, and admirably carried out. The book is well worthy of the consideration of all thoughtful men. It was badly needed, and it will surely benefit greatly all who read it slowly and with serious thought. J. P. T.

---

MANUAL OF PATROLOGY. By the *Reverned Bernard Schmid, O. S. B.* Freely translated from the fifth German edition by a Benedictine. Revised with notes and additions for English readers by the *Right Rev. Mgr. V. G. Schobel, D. D.*, with preface by the *Right Rev. J. A. Hedley*, Bishop of Newport. 12mo, pp. 351. St. Louis: B. Herder.

Here is a very important book. It might have been called "An Introduction to the Fathers," for in the hands of the student it will answer the same purpose in regard to patristic writings that the introduction to the Sacred Scriptures answers in regard to the Bible. This is evident from the words of the author in the introduction, where he thus sets forth the scope of the book: "By Patrology is meant a systematic treatment and exposition of such preliminary subjects and questions as are necessary to acquire a proper knowledge of the writings of the Fathers, and to make proper use of them in theology. Patrology, therefore, differs from the knowledge of the Fathers, or what is called patristical science, the special object of which is to arrange systematically, according to definite principles, all that can be gathered from the works of the Fathers concerning matters of faith, morals, and ecclesiastical discipline. Nor is it the same as the history of the ancient Christian literature, because the latter includes the literary works not only of the Fathers, but also of the other ancient ecclesiastical writers, and confines itself to the

consideration of the historical development of Christian literature, as such.

The object, therefore, of Patrology in this narrow sense, is in the first place, to lay down and establish the rules and principles which help to determine the authority of the Fathers, and the authenticity, right use, and application of their works in theology. In the next place, its object is to give some account of the life, education, mental training, literary and pastoral work of each of the Fathers, also to determine their precise position in the church, with their relative merits in eccleiastical science. A further duty of Patrology is to explain the substance, scope, and number of their writings, the peculiarity of their views, their style of writing, and finally to indicate the last editions of their works. In its wider and less proper sense, however, it also takes into consideration those ecclesiastical authors who, though not Fathers, have yet exercised more or less influence upon the development of Christian life and knowledge." This explanation of the scope of the work clearly shows the importance of it, and Bishop Hedley in the Preface speaks of the necessity of the knowledge of the Fathers for every divinity student. He also points out the impossibility of mastering the whole collection of their writings. It is equally difficult to cull from them what is needed, and hence the necessity of a guide book. This volume does all that it promises. After preliminary chapters on the "Meaning and Object of Patrology," "Importance of Patrology," "History of Patrology," and "Division of Patrology," the author explains the meaning of the terms "Writer," "Father," and "Doctor," and then shows the authority of the Fathers in general, singly, in matters of faith and morals, in the interpretation of Holy Scriptures and in ascetical and pastoral theology. Then follow biographical sketches of the Fathers with lists of their works and of the different editions. Altogether, the book is a most welcome addition to the theologian's library, whether he be a first year divinity student, or a veteran in the service. J. P. T.

---

THE HISTORY OF ST. CATHERINE OF SIENA, AND HER COMPANIONS, with a Translation of her Treatise on Consummate Perfection. By *Augusta Theodosia Drane.* Third edition in two volumes. 8vo, pp. 389 and 376. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Before the publication of this biography, sixty other Lives of St. Catherine of Siena had appeared in various languages. The author's apology for adding another to the long list is, that most

of them are little more than translations of the original Legend written by Raymond of Capua, the Saint's Confessor, and only two of them are in English. These two are unsatisfactory for several reasons, and therefore a full life, chronologically arranged, drawing generously on the letters of the Saint, and on the testimony of her companions, together with some account of those companions, seemed to be called for.

"In the present volumes the writer has aimed at giving the facts of St. Catherine's life as recorded by other biographers, restoring their chronological order, and at the same time supplementing them with additional matter drawn from original sources hitherto either partially or entirely neglected. Very ample use has been made of St. Catherine's own letters, those wonderful compositions of which we as yet possess no English translation, but a knowledge of which is essential to our forming any real acquaintance with the saintly writer. Yet the letters themselves cannot be understood without some explanation of the history and circumstances of those to whom they were addressed; and this naturally introduces the reader to the members of that spiritual "family" of which she was the Mother and Head."

"Stupendous as is the story of her life, it has a side which brings her within the reach of ordinary sympathies. Catherine, the Seraphic Bride of Christ, espoused to Him at Siena; stigmatised at Pisa; supported on the Bread of Life; the Pacificator of Florence; the ambassadress of Gregory; the Councillor of Urban; the Martyr for the Unity of the Holy See;—this is indeed a character that overwhelms us with its greatness. But Catherine, the Lover of God and man, who gave away her will with her heart to her divine spouse; the tender mother of a spiritual family; the friend of the poor; the healer of feuds, the lover of her country;—Catherine, with all her natural gifts of prudence and womanly tact; with her warm affections, and her love of the beautiful; with her rare genius, refined spiritualised, and perfected Divine illumination; surrounded by men and women like ourselves, with whose infirmities she bore, and whom she loved as heartily as they loved her in return; Catherine, with her wise and graceful words, her "gracious smile," and her sweet attractive presence,—this is a being to be loved and imitated; we open our very hearts to receive her within them, and to enshrine her there, not as a saint only, but as a mother and a friend."

ST. JOHN DAMASCENE on HOLY IMAGES, followed by Three Sermons on the Assumption, translated from the Original Greek by *Mary H. Allies.* 12mo, pp. 216. London: Thomas Baker.

There is a peculiar fitness in the appearance of this book in England at this time. That most senseless of all heresies, Iconoclasm, has reappeared in the attacks which are now being made on churches in which Ritualists worship. We had begun to flatter ourselves that we had passed through all stages of heresy, never again to return to them, somewhat as in childhood we pass through measles and whooping-cough and the other ills of that age never again to return to them. But dear! dear! in this age of enlightenment, as if to give the lie to all our boastfulness, we find ourselves returning to the most senseless of all senseless heresies—Iconoclasm. Now, isn't it sad that we should be such bad behaved children at a when we ought to behave best. If we were smaller, those who love us would spank us and put us out of the way until we were better minded. But we are too big for that, and therefore they must reason with us.

It is not necessary to invent a new way. The disease is an old one, having appeared first in the eighth century, and the remedy is just as old. God raised up the physician in the person of St. John Damascene, and Mrs. Allies has placed the prescription within the reach of all by translating the admirable treatise of the Christian Doctor into English. No new argument is needed. The use of images in divine worship is just as reasonable now as it was in the eighth century or the first. It is God's way. The Son is the image of the Father; from eternity by essence, and in time taking a visible form to teach us that our worship of God is through corporeal things.

We are so constituted that we must have images: our minds cannot reach God without the help of corporeal things.

How consoling it is for a Catholic to find himself standing behind those champions of his faith who lived and fought hundreds of years ago, and whose words are as true and powerful now as they were then, because the doctrines in defence of which they were spoken never change.

The defence of St. John Damascene is as timely now as it was when it was first made. Mrs Allies has chosen a good work and she has done it well. The book is very nicely made: good print, good paper, good general makeup. Altogether one of the notable books of the year. J. P. T.

THE INNER LIFE OF LADY GEORGIANA FULLERTON, with Notes of Retreat and Diary. 12mo, pp. 400. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Lady Fullerton is tolerably well known to the Catholic reading world through her works of fiction. Her exterior life, writings and good works have been recorded in an admirable "Memoir," written in French by the late Mrs. Craven, and translated into English by the late Father Coleridge, S. J. In the preface to the translation, Father Coleridge states, "that a fuller and more detailed life might have been looked for, and that the present one is but a sketch."

The volume before us gives that fuller and more detailed life. It is not an enlargement of the previous work, but rather a supplement to it; whereas the former volume gave us a picture of the exterior life, the present one deals with the interior.

It may surprise the general public to hear that, although Lady Fullerton has been dead only fourteen years, those who know her best, and who know also how jealously the Church watches over the honor and glory of her saints, and how long and searching is the examination which precedes the "Introduction of the Cause" which results in the person in question being honored with the title of Venerable, believe that an account of her holy example and rare virtues should be brought to the notice of the Holy See. They have been encouraged to take such action by competent authority in Rome, and hence this book. It gives glimpses into her inner life which could be gotten in no other way. This is especially true of her letters, of her notes or retreats, and of her diary.

It is most edifying, and besides answering the purpose for which it was primarily written, it ought to be of great value to ladies in the world who are trying to serve God in the midst of distractions.

---

TRACTATUS DE CENSURIS, CASIBUS RESERVATIS, IRREGULARITATIBUS ET LIBRIS PROHIBITIS. ADUSUM ALUMNORUM SEMINRRII ARCHIEP. MECHLINENSIS. ED. ALTERA. 1897, pp. 239. pr. 3.20 francs.

SACRA LITURGIA TOM. I. TRACTATUS DE OFFICIO DIVINO, AUCTORE J. V. Van Der Strapper. 1898, pp. 337. pr. 4.30 francs: Mechliniae: H. Dessain (Benziger, N. Y.)

The Diocesan Seminary of Mechlin, in Belgium, is fortunate in having a theological faculty which produces such excellent manuals as these, for the use of its own students. The series whereof these two volumes form a part covers the full course of Moral Theology and Sacred Liturgy, five small volumes being devoted to the latter and eleven to the former branch. There are, of course, few institutions that can afford to adopt so extensive a curriculum of study as the use of these text books implies, though

there is something to be said in favor of generously constructed instruments of this kind even when put into operation under narrower limitations of time. The author of each of these manuals had evidently in view the principle of time and labor saving. Each has moulded his matter in the shape of question and answer, thus facilitating the apprehension of the essence of the subjects; and this is farther enhanced in the case of the first volume by the use of marginal synopses, and in the second by typographical variety.

For the rest the titles sufficiently indicate to those interested in theological studies the general scope of the works.

---

A Dictionary of the Bible, dealing with its Language, Literature and Contents, including the Biblical Theology. Edited by *James Hastings, M. A., D. D.*, with the assistance of *John A. Selbie, M. A.* In four imperial octavo volumes. Vol. 2, Feign-Kinsman, pp. 870. Maps and illustrations. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

This work was noticed in the Quarterly when the first volume came from the press. The second volume is fully up to the standard of the first, and that is very high in many respects.

The editors claim for the book that it is up to date; that it is based on the latest revisions of the text; that it is more comprehensive than any preceding dictionary; and that it keeps pace with the development of the history of the Hebrew people, and the advances made by archaeologists and geographists in recent times. It seems to bear out all these claims, and yet it fails in one very important particular—it has not one Catholic editor on its large staff. The need for such a one is shown very strongly in the present volume under the heading "James," where the statement is made without the mention of the possibility of any other opinion, that James was the natural son of St. Joseph and the Blessed Virgin. We have chosen this instance at random, and called attention to it in order that our readers may understand that all such questions are dealt with from one point of view only.

---

De Voti Natura, Obligatione, Honestate: Commentatio Theologica quam scripsit *C. Kirchberg, D. D.* Münster (Westf.) Asschendorffsche Buchhandlung, 1897, pp. 222; pr. 3.60 marks.

The subject of vows is beset with such difficulties and is nevertheless so essential a factor in the sacerdotal and religious states of the Church that it surely deserves to be selected from the general body of Theological Science to be given special treatment. This is what Dr. Kirchberg, Professor in the Diocesan Seminary

of Paderborn, has done in the present monograph. He enters somewhat minutely into the definition, matter, psychology and classification of vows; the conditions and interpretation of their binding power, cessation, dispensation, commutation; and closes with a strong apology for vows in general and the religious vows in particular. The work is written in a singularly clear style. What especially commends it to the earnest student is the bibliographical apparatus, which reflects the broad erudition and patient labor that has come to be the recognized distinction of the German professor.

---

AN ESSAY CONTRIBUTING TO A PHILOSOPHY OF LITERATURE. By *Brother Azarias*, of the Christians Schools. Seventh edition revised and enlarged (reprint.) 12mo, pp. 289. Phila.: John Jos. McVey.

It is sixteen years since this essay first saw the light on printed page, and it has lost nothing of its excellence with the lapse of time. On the contrary it has gained, because its good qualities have been confirmed by the events of passing years.

Truth does not change. It may seem to change, because other things are constantly changing and they present it to us under different aspects, but in itself it is always the same. Hence true philosophy cannot change, and hence the lasting worth of this essay. It brought its author before the literary world very prominently, because its worth was at once recognized by reading, thoughtful men, irrespective of creed. It took a place in the front rank of thought-moving literature which it has retained until the present time, and will retain indefinitely. It gave its author a literary standing in the community which he was in every way able to sustain, but which he might not have gained by years of labor on other lines.

Such a book cannot be reproduced too often, nor multiplied too quickly, and the publisher who invests his capital in such good work, should be highly commended, and well supported.

---

REPRODUCTIONS OF THE FAMOUS PAINTINGS in the Imperial Cathedral at Speyer on the Rhine. Large octavo paper. New York: J. Shaefer.

This is a very laudable attempt to reproduce and circulate excellent works of art, which in the original must remain hidden from the eyes of the greater number of Catholics who cannot travel to them. This collection consists of thirty-eight photographic reproductions, beginning with the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise, and ending with the closing scenes of the life

of Christ on earth. The originals are well worthy of reproduction, and the reproductions are well worthy of the originals.

---

St. Ignatius Loyola. By *Henri Joly*, author of "The Psychology of the Saints." Translated by *Mildred Partridge*, with a preface by *George Tyrrell, S. J.* 12mo, pp. xi, 262. London: Duckworth & Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This is the sixth of the new series of Lives of the Saints, which was begun with "The Psychology of the Saints." A lengthy review of the first three volumes was made in the Quarterly when they first appeared. They were excellent in every particular, and gave promise that the whole series would be a valuable contribution to hagiography. That promise is being kept. Each new contribution that comes from the press is fully up to the high standard set in the beginning, and consistantly carries out the original design to set before us the man or woman as a whole and as he or she appeared in real life. They are not learned exhaustive histories, but simple, brief, truthful narratives.

Father Tyrrell's introductions go before all the volumes, and are always entertaining and instructive.

---

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The History of St. Catherine of Siena and Her Companions, with a translation of her Treatise on Consummate Perfection, by *Augusta Theodoria Drane*, author of Christian Schools and Scholars, etc. Third edition in two volumes, 8vo., pp. xx, 389 and 376. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Pictorial Lives of the Saints, with Reflections for Every Day in the year, compiled from Butler's Lives and other approved sources. Edited by *John Gilmany Shea*. New edition, large, 8vo, pp. 538; nearly 400 illustrations. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Natural Law and Legal Practice. Lectures delivered at the Law School of Georgetown University by *Rene I. Holaind, S. J.* 8vo, pp. 344. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The Sacraments Explained According to the Teaching and Doctrine of the Catholic Church, with an Introductory Treatise on Grace. By the *Rev. Arthur Devine*, Passionist. 12mo, pp. xxxvi, 515. London: R. & T. Washbourne. New York: Benziger Brothers.

St. John Damascene on Holy Images, followed by Three Sermons on the Assumption. Translated from the original Greek by *Mary H. Allies*. 12mo, pp. 216. London: Thomas Baker.

The King's Mother, Memoir of Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby. By *Lady Margaret Domvile*. 12mo, pp. 213. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Saint Ignatius Loyola. By *Henri Joly*, author of "The Phychology of the Saints." Translated by *Mildred Partridge*, with a Preface by *George Tyrrell, S. J.* 12mo, pp. xiv, 262. London: Duckworth & Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The Course of Conscience. Being a short inquiry as to the Transmission of Revelation. *H. J. Pye*. 12mo, pp. 102. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

AN ESSAY CONTRIBUTING TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF LITERATURE. By *Brother Azarias*, of the Brothers of the Christian Schools. New edition. 12mo, pp. 289. Philadelphia: John Jos. McVey.

THE CHILD OF GOD, OR WHAT COMES OF OUR BAPTISM. By *Mother Mary Loyola*, of the Bar Convent, York. Edited by *Father Thurston, S. J.* 12mo, pp. xiv, 283. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

BUSINESS GUIDE FOR PRIESTS. By *Rev. Wm. Strang, D. D.*, Vice-Rector of American College, Louvain. 8vo, pp. 107. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE REACTION FROM AGNOSTIC SCIENCE. By *Rev. W. J. Madden*, author of "Disunion and Reunion." Second edition. 12mo, pp. 206. St. Louis: B. Herder.

THE ROMAN PRIMACY, A. D. 430-451. By the *Rev. Luke Rivington, M. A., D. D.* 12mo. pp. xxii., 405. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

THE SACRED HEART, Anecdotes and Examples to Assist in Promoting the Devotion to the Sacred Heart. From the original of *Rev. Dr. Jos. Keller.* 16mo, pp. 256. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN, Anecdotes and Examples to Illustrate the Honor Due to the Mother of God. From the original of *Rev. Dr. Jos. Keller.* 16mo, pp. 241. New York: Benziger Brothers.

OUR MONTHLY DEVOTIONS. By *Very Rev. Dean A. A. Lings.* 16mo, pp. 635. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE BLESSED SACRAMENT, Anecdotes and Examples to Illustrate the Honor and Glory Due to the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar. From the original of *Rev. Dr. Jos. Keller.* 16mo, pp. 251. New York: Benziger Brothers.

LIBRARY OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES, Works of this Doctor of the Church Translated into English. By the *Very Rev. H. B. Canon Mackey, O. S. B.*, under the direction of the *Right Rev. John C. Hedley, O. S. B.*, Bishop of Newport. Vol. 3. The Catholic Controversy. Second edition, revised and augmented. 12mo, pp. xxii. 393. London: Burns & Oakes. New York: Benziger Brothers.

PERIODICAL

70756

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM